

THE
EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

NO. VII.

JANUARY, 1851.

ARTICLE I.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT OF CHRIST, AS IT IS
PRESENTED IN THE SYMBOLICAL BOOKS OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

By Rev. Charles F. Schaeffer, D. D., Red Hook, N. Y.

THE venerable Reinhard, who was one of the brightest ornaments of the Church, and whose virtues and learning exerted a commanding influence in his day, delivered a discourse on one occasion, while he held the office of Court-Precacher in Dresden, which, unexpectedly, led to a protracted controversy. According to the admirable custom of Lutheran pastors in Europe, he preached a sermon on the anniversary of the Reformation in the year 1800, which specially referred to the history and the doctrines of the Church. It was his object to show, in this particular sermon, that the Church is indebted for her existence principally to the restoration of the doctrine of the free grace of God in Christ—a doctrine, long obscured, or entirely suppressed by Popery. His sovereign, by the advice of his Privy Council, directed that one or more copies of this noble discourse should be delivered to every church or congregation in his dominions, and significantly admonished the public teachers of religion to proclaim in their sermons, or when they visited the sick, or when they gave religious instructions to the young, the fundamental doctrines which this sermon discussed, namely: the free grace of God in Christ, justification by faith alone, the insufficiency of human virtue,

VOL. II. No. 7.

39

&c. During several subsequent years, numerous pamphlets or small volumes were published by different writers, of whom some advocated the doctrines of Reinhard and the Church, while others violently assailed them. The fidelity of the historic and doctrinal statements which he had made, was not impugned, but the doctrines themselves were unwelcome, and their philosophic truth or consistency with human reason was absolutely denied by the foul spirit of Rationalism, which still controlled many pulpits and professors' chairs at that period, and which was irritated by the renewed homage that was paid to the truths of the Bible and the Symbolical Books of the Church.¹

The eminent man, whose distinguished position in the Church, as well as the lustre of whose abilities and personal character gave additional importance to the controversy, which he was, however, far from having designedly provoked by his sermon, makes one remark in the latter, of which the following is the substance: While our Confessions of faith (Symbolical Books) introduce very numerous subjects, and copiously discuss the causes which rendered the Reformation necessary, still, their chief subject (*Hauptinhalt*) is the doctrine of the text, Romans 3: 23—25, viz., that man is justified and saved by grace, without merit, through faith in Christ alone. He, then, illustrates the power and fidelity of Luther in pro-

¹The remote cause, which led to the delivery of this celebrated sermon, was peculiar. A bookseller of Leipsic, named Dyk, had submitted to Reinhard the manuscript of a catechetical work, with the expectation of receiving a recommendation which would increase the sale. To Reinhard's surprise, when he examined it, no reference whatever to the grace of God in Christ, as taught in the third chapter of Romans, was made in this catechism! He gave Dyk a written statement respecting this unpardonable omission, and, in accordance with his custom of committing to writing all homiletical ideas which occurred to him in the course of his studies or his experience, by which the *themes* of his sermons became remarkable for their variety, he was led, incidentally, as it seemed, to record among his materials for sermons the well-known proposition which formed, soon after, the theme of this sermon. (Poelitz — Reinhard n. s. Leben &c. II. p. 164). All the members of cabinet of the sovereign were present when it was delivered, and, so profound was the impression made upon them, that they immediately issued the "rescript" by the authority of their master to which we have referred above. This procedure distressed Reinhard exceedingly, as we learn from his letters to Schatter and Sarwey, not merely from the personal consideration, that many might suppose him to have suggested this course himself, with unbecoming vanity, but chiefly, because, on principle, he says, that he "never could approve of the issue of rescripts by the government which related, not to church discipline, but to points of faith." Still the uncommon sensation created throughout Germany by the publication of this sermon, produced many happy results. The joy which he experienced on finding, that Evangelical truth possessed such vast numbers of decided friends, consoled him alike for the mortification inflicted on him by this act of the government, and for the contumelious language in which his adversaries indulged.

claiming and adhering to this doctrine, and laments, in touching expressions, the indifference with which many regarded it in his day.

While the "orthodox churches" around us, adopt many of our leading views in reference to this general subject, there are certain features of the doctrine of the Atonement of Christ which are peculiar to our Church, and which do not re-appear in the Confessions of others. But if the doctrine of the mediatorial work of Christ, in its whole extent, is, according to Reinhard, the very life of Protestantism, or rather, of scriptural orthodoxy, we cannot consent to sacrifice one jot or tittle of it, for every portion must be of inestimable value. A high degree of importance, consequently, attaches to the question : *What are the doctrinal views of the Evangelical Lutheran Church respecting the Atonement?* The answer, which we propose to submit, will, incidentally, notice certain variations in the creeds of other ecclesiastical bodies. As our object is simply to set forth the form in which this doctrine appears in our Symbols, we shall omit the proof-passages from Scripture, which are presented in every respectable theological treatise on the subject, and are here assumed as well-known. Our present design does not require us to notice the philological aspects of the subject (*καταλλαγή, ἀπολύτρωσις, at-one-ment, &c.*), nor will our limits permit us to enlarge on the necessity, extent, &c., of the Atonement.

Briefly expressed, our doctrine of the Atonement is the following: The effect of sin, both original and actual, was, not only to render man guilty, but also to leave him utterly incapable of obtaining salvation by his own works. Now Jesus Christ, who was both God and man, as our only Mediator, by his vicarious obedience to the law, and by his vicarious sufferings and death, offered, in both natures, a full satisfaction to divine justice; the effect of this atonement was a reconciliation between God and man. No merits or satisfactions, besides those of Christ, can have any efficacy in securing the pardon of sins: neither are they necessary, since the work of Christ was completely performed, when he made an atonement for man according to his two natures, and as well by his whole life as by his sufferings and death. By the grace of God, the benefits of this atonement are freely offered to all men, and are imparted, in all their fullness, to those who repent and believe. "Scripture teaches us, that the righteousness of faith before God consists alone in his merciful, that is, his gratuitous reconciliation, or in the remission of sins, which, through grace only, and solely on account of the merit of Christ the

Mediator, is given to us, and apprehended or received only through faith in the promise of the Gospel." F. C. p. 689.¹ This "merit" of Christ is equivalent to his perfect obedience to the law, both in his life and his death, involving also the idea of his sinlessness, and gives him a claim to blessedness which is transferred or imparted to the believer.

The following quotations from our Symbolical Books, founded on both the Latin and German copies, set forth our views still more fully. "Our churches teach that — — Christ, truly God and truly man, who was born of the Virgin Mary, truly suffered, was crucified, died and was buried, in order that he might reconcile the Father to us, and be a sacrifice not only for original sin, but also for all the actual sins of men." Augsb. Conf. Art. III. See also Art. IV. "This (doctrine, viz., that God is propitious to us on account of the satisfaction of Christ, and not on account of our fulfilling of the law) is taught by Paul, Gal. 3: 13, when he says: 'Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us,' that is, the law condemns all men, but Christ, by suffering the punishment of sin, while he was himself without sin, and by being 'made a victim for us, took away that right (or claim) of the law, so that it may not accuse and condemn those who believe on him, because he himself is the propitiation for them, on account of which propitiation, they are regarded as just." Apology, p. 93. "The death of Christ is a satisfaction not only for guilt, but also for eternal death." *ibid.* p. 190. "The remaining portions of this article (i. e. Art. II. of the Apostles' Creed) set forth — — what it cost Christ — — to gain us — — namely, that he became a man — — and besides, suffered; died and was buried, that he might make satisfaction for me, and bear my guilt, for which I should have suffered, and that, not with gold and silver, but with his precious blood." Large Catech. p. 494.

Our doctrine is adequately expressed, not simply by the term "vicarious death," but by "vicarious obedience or satisfaction" which comprehends the former. A "vicar," is "in a general sense, a person deputed or authorized to perform the functions of another; a substitute in office." (Webster). A vicarious *act* is one that is performed by one person in place of another. Thus Christ as our substitute or vicar, fulfilled the law, and

¹F. C. is the usual abbreviation of the name of the *Formula Concordiæ*, which the Germans have always called *Concordienformel* or *Eintrachtsformel* in their own language, and for which we prefer, in English, *Concord-Formula* as possibly a more exact rendering than *Form of Concord*, which is a neat term, but a less faithful version.

suffered the punishment of sin, whereby he satisfied the justice of God. Hence, our Symbols say: "Christ made satisfaction for our sins by his death." Augsb. Conf. Art. IV. "We teach that the sacrifice of Christ dying on the cross, was sufficient for the sins of the whole world, and that we do not need any other sacrifices (such as canonical satisfactions, masses, pilgrimages, fastings, &c. imposed by the church of Rome), as if that one sacrifice were not sufficient for our sins." Apol. p. 201. The following passage, (a translation of the combined Latin and German), is one of the most important: "Two things belong to a Mediator and Propitiator. First, a word or promise of God, from which we may learn with confidence that he will have pity on all those who call on him through this Mediator, and that he will hear them. (Here various appropriate Scripture passages follow, John 16: 23, 24, &c., and the popish doctrine of the invocation of saints is rejected — the symbol proceeds): Secondly, that the merits of this Propitiator should be set forth as a satisfaction for others, who should consequently partake of them by a divine imputation, in such a manner that they may thereby be accounted just or righteous as fully as if these merits were personally their own. When a friend pays a debt which another owes, the latter is freed from the debt by the payment of his friend, as fully as if it were his own act. Thus, the merits of Christ are given and imputed to us, so that we are accounted righteous by our faith in his merits, when we believe in him, as if these merits were our own." Apol. p. 226. The Church, consequently, believes that Christ's perfect obedience is accepted in place of our own, and is imputed to us, but only when we exercise faith, and come to God through Christ. Without a genuine change of heart, the merits of Christ, according to our Church, are not imputed, and do not save the impenitent from eternal death.

We possess, however, additional developments of the doctrine of the Atonement, which, if we are faithful to the cause of truth, we can never consent to suppress. The strong attachment of the Lutheran to the Symbolical Books is produced chiefly, it is true, by their own intrinsic value, as a body of pure and unadulterated truth; still, their claims on our reverence, merely in a historical point of view, are also very powerful; their agency, in deciding important doctrinal questions connected with the Atonement, and in restoring internal peace to the Church, cannot be too highly appreciated. It is self-evident that two doctrines which contradict each other, cannot both be true. Now when only one of these is openly profess-

ed, or when neither is elevated to the rank of an article of faith, we may easily account for the silence of any special Creed on that particular point; hence, the earlier creeds of the Church (the three ecumenical Symbols), which were prepared previous to the Reformation, are exceedingly brief. Even the Augsburg Confession, to which many inconsiderately desire to restrict us, confines itself chiefly to the points of faith to which the circumstances of the times had given special importance. But when the minds of men are powerfully urged to investigate truth, and leading spirits propose new views, others often arise who refuse their sanction to these novel dogmas. When such new views affect established doctrines, and either confirm or contradict them, they cannot be dismissed merely with a smile of acquiescence, or a frown of disapprobation. If two statements are found to be antagonistic, one of which is certainly false, and if the Church really possesses an infallible guide in the Scriptures, or if she sincerely values truth more than error, she cannot allow a dangerous error to prevail without contradiction. In the course of time, as the doctrine of the Atonement was more profoundly studied, it was contemplated in various aspects in which the ancient Church had never been invited to consider it, and, while many of these new views were wisely adapted to explain divine truth, others threatened to undermine the whole structure of the Christian faith, unless they were promptly and sternly disavowed. New theological terms were also gradually introduced, expressive of a certain orthodox or heterodox form of faith, and the Church was compelled to discriminate between them, or permit a looseness of doctrine to become prevalent, which would have soon obliterated all the marks by which truth is distinguished from error. Such conflicting views were not only published after the earlier periods of the Reformation, but were loudly and tenaciously maintained by their respective adherents as essential portions of religious truth. The Concord-Formula here rendered the Church inestimable service, by examining questions of vital importance, which had not been previously investigated or decided in the earlier symbols, and by maintaining the unity and consistency of our holy faith. While we, therefore, regard the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Smalcald Articles, and the Small and Large Catechisms with undiminished reverence, we bless God that, in his gracious Providence, he permitted the Church to receive, in addition to these precious writings, the admirable Concord-Formula, which, while opposed by the unbeliever, and undervalued by the latitudinarian, will ever be regarded

by the Lutheran as the crown and glory of the Symbolical Books. As an illustration of our meaning, we refer to the decisions of this Creed respecting the *active* and *passive* obedience of Christ, and his mediatorship in *both* natures.

Previous to the age of Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, who died, A. D. 1109, theological authors had introduced the most discordant views respecting the atonement of Christ; the established and recognized tenets of the Church were as often obscured or virtually suppressed, as they were illustrated and confirmed. At length, Anselm published the celebrated work entitled: *Cur Deus homo*, in which he presented a system better defined and more logically framed than any which had yet appeared, as well as distinguished by clearer views than any previous theological treatise had proposed. As our own Church-doctrine has been somewhat influenced by the Anselmic theory, without, however, sanctioning all its specifications, we present its leading features. They are the following:—

The honor and majesty of the infinite God had been outraged in an infinite degree by sin: the harmony of the plan, according to which he governed all things, had been disturbed: his authority had been practically denied when man sinned. His justice could not remit the punishment due to sin without receiving satisfaction;¹ by this word, originally applied by Tertullian (who died A. D. 220) to the atonement of Christ, Anselm understood a rendering to the justice of God of all that was due to it, in order to restore the violated honor of God and the harmony of the universe, which depended on the full recognition of God's sovereignty by every creature. The position in which man had placed himself by his sinful course admitted of no relief which his own acts could afford: the penalty which he justly incurred was temporal and eternal death; he could perform no good works that would be capable of atoning for his sin, of releasing him from the continued operation of the penalty, and of restoring him to divine favor, since obedience or the most faithful practice of virtue was simply a duty which he, as a creature, already owed to the Creator: he could expect relief neither from a fellow-mortal, since each individual of the human race was worthy of death, nor from an angel, since every *creature*, however holy and ex-

¹Our older theologians thus define the word: "*Satisfactio est actus officii sacerdotalis, quo Christus, ex decreto divino, consummatissima obedientia, activa et passiva, justitiæ divinæ, peccatis hominum læsæ, satisfacit, in laudem justitiæ et misericordiæ divinæ, et acquisitionem nostræ justitiæ et salutis.*"

alted in rank, is still a finite being and possesses no excellence or power in his own right: even an angel could not offer an atonement to the offended majesty of the infinite God which would be an equivalent for the offence committed, and would, without leading to his own perdition, fully restore fallen man. Now Christ, as God himself, could, as an infinite being, offer an expiation for infinite guilt, and, as man, he was capable of suffering death, and could also enable men to appropriate to themselves the merits of the sinless man, Christ Jesus. The reward to which he was, as man, entitled on account of his merits or obedience, and with which, as God, he could dispense, remained to be imputed to the human race.

Two different developments of this theory were subsequently presented by the Thomists and the Scotists. The former, agreeably to the views of the "angelic doctor" Thomas Aquinas (who died A. D. 1274), maintained that the satisfaction rendered by Christ, being *per se* of infinite value was more than sufficient, or more than divine justice could demand, and that it constituted a source of superabundant merit, but that, nevertheless, it contemplated original sin alone, while it left to men the work of atoning for their actual sins. This appendage to the Anselmic theory, adopted by the Dominicans and subsequently by the Jesuits, was virtually sanctioned by the Council of Trent, which, by its acts, afforded so many evidences of the absurdity of the claims of Popery to infallibility. The Scotists, espousing the views of the "subtile doctor" Duns Scotus, (who died A. D. 1308), and sustained by the Franciscans, denied that the satisfaction of Christ, which they also referred simply to original sin, was infinite, and held that while Christ merited salvation for himself by shedding his blood, and while that blood was sufficient for man's salvation, still, it was sufficient, not by its own infinite value, but because God was satisfied with it and *accepted* it as a sufficient atonement. The Arminians adopted the Scotistic view, and held that the merit of Christ was indeed only sufficient in part, but that God has accepted it as a full satisfaction; and this view is probably held by the Methodists. Their text-book (Watson's Theol. Institutes) presents the doctrine in these terms: "The death of Christ, then, is the satisfaction *accepted*; and this being a satisfaction to *justice*, that is, a *consideration* which satisfied God &c." Part II. Ch. 20, p. 271. "The only true sense of the sufferings of Christ being a full equivalent for the remission of the punishment due to the guilty, is, that they equally availed to the satisfying of Divine justice, and vindicating the authority of his laws, that they were equivalent, in

the estimation of a just Governor, in the administration of his laws, to the punishment of the guilty; equivalent, in effect, to a *legal satisfaction*, which would consist in the enforcement upon the persons of the offenders of the penalty of the violated commandment." *ibid.* p. 272. The influence of the system of Grotius, which teaches an acceptance on the part of God, of an insufficient or incomplete atonement as a sufficient atonement is discernible in this representation. Many fatal objections may be made against the minuteness and boldness of the Arminian scheme, on which it is not, however, necessary to enlarge.

All these refinements of doctrine, which, frequently, terminate in sophistry and positive error, are calmly avoided by the Lutheran Church, which, in contradiction from the frivolous and heterodox opinions of many earlier writers, adopts, in conformity to the written word, several of the leading views presented by the Anselmic theory in their simplest form. Without presuming to penetrate the mysteries of God, or attempting to define a mode in which the death of Christ satisfied the justice of God, she rigidly holds to the fact, that a satisfaction *was* made, and discards all the additions with which Popery and the sects that arose after the Reformation, burdened the pure Scripture doctrine. The Church simply says: "These are required and are necessary to salvation, namely, the grace of God, the merit of Christ, and faith" &c. F. C. p. 687. But there were other points of vast importance, which the Church *has* decided in the Concord-Formula, to two of which, peculiar to her creed in their fullness and beauty, we have previously made an allusion. We distinguish between the *active* and the *passive* obedience of Christ: the former is a *legal* satisfaction, and consists of Christ's most perfect fulfilling of the law in our stead; the latter, or *penal* satisfaction, is his most sufficient and voluntary endurance, in his vicarious death, of the penalties which man deserved. We subjoin the following extracts: "That righteousness which, before God, is imputed to faith or to believers, through grace alone, is, the obedience, suffering and resurrection of Christ, whereby he satisfied the law for our sakes, and made expiation for our sins. For since Christ was not only a man, but God and man in one undivided person, he was as little placed under the law, as he was subject to suffering and death, that is, as to his person, since he was the Lord of the law. Hence, his obedience, by which we mean not only that which he rendered to the Father in the whole course of his sufferings and in

his death, but also that by which, for our sakes, he voluntarily subjected himself to the law and fulfilled it, is imputed to us for righteousness, so that God, on account of this full and complete obedience, (which Christ actively and passively, or by works and sufferings in his life and death, rendered to his heavenly Father for our sakes) forgives our sins, regards us as just and righteous, and bestows upon us eternal salvation. His righteousness is exhibited to us by the Holy Spirit, through the Gospel and in the Sacraments, and is applied and appropriated by faith, &c. F. C. p. sq. 684, 685. "And thus our faith looks to the person of Christ, in as far as he subjected himself to the law for us, bore our sins, and, when he went to the Father, rendered a complete, absolute and most perfect obedience to his heavenly Father for us most miserable sinners, from his most holy birth to his death. By which obedience on his part he covered all our disobedience which adheres to our nature and its thoughts, words and works, so that our disobedience is not imputed to us unto condemnation, but through grace alone, for Christ's sake, is pardoned and remitted." F. C. p. 697. Traces of this emphatically Lutheran doctrine occur in several Reformed Symbols. The *Heidelberg Catechism* contains the following: "He is our Mediator, and by his innocence and perfect holiness he covers before the face of God my sins, in which I was conceived." Ans. to Qu. 36. The *Formula Consensus Helvetica*, Can. 15 and 16, discriminates still more clearly, and claims that both the active and passive obedience of Christ are given and imputed to the elect. This Confession, prepared by J. H. Heidegger of Zurich, in connection with F. Turretin of Geneva, and, at one time, extensively adopted, contains the following very sound statements: "rotundo asserit ore Spiritus Dei Christum sanctissima vita legi et justitiæ divinæ pro nobis satisfecisse, et pretium illud, quo empti sumus Deo, non in passionibus duntaxat, sed tota ejus vita legi conformata collocat. Morti autem vel sanguini Christi Redemptionem nostram vindicat haud alio sensu, quam quid is per passiones consummatus est. Atque ita quidem ab extremo illo terminante et nobilissimo actu, sine quo salus nostra constare non potuisset, quique omnium virtutum speculum fuit lucidissimum, denominationem facit, ut tamen a morte vitam anteactam neutiquam secludat." Calvin himself (Institutes, Book II. Chapt. xvi. § 5.) accords with us, in the following terms: (we copy from Allen's translation,) "Now in answer to the inquiry, how Christ . . . procured a righteousness to render him favorable and propitious to us, it may be replied in general, that he accomplished it by the whole course

of his obedience. This is proved by the testimony of Paul, (Romans 5: 19, Galat. 4: 4, 5, are here quoted) . . . Yet more precisely to define the means of our salvation (Allen does not here render the original with precision: *Scriptura tamen, quo certius definiat modum salutis, &c.*) the Scripture ascribes this in a peculiar manner to the death of Christ. . . . Yet there is no exclusion of the rest of the obedience which he performed in his life: as Paul comprehends the whole of it, from the beginning to the end, when he says that 'he made himself of no reputation,' &c. Phil. 2: 7, 8," &c. Even Robert Barclay, the celebrated apologist of the Quakers, in his well-known "*Theol. v. chr. Apologia*," of which he published an English translation in 1678, incidentally mentions the *integra obedientia* of Christ as a part of his work in connection with his *mors* and *passiones*. The peculiarities, however, of the Quaker doctrine of the Atonement we have no room to explain. They cannot be reconciled with our views.

The church of Rome does not distinctly recognize the "active obedience" of Christ, (Koellner, *Symb. d.-kathol.-Kirche*. Vol. II. p. 315), and the Arminians, who, like Episcopius, regard Christ not as the Lord of the law, but merely as its subject, positively disavow it. Hence the Methodist Watson (*Theol. Inst. Part II. Chapt. 20. p. 271*), who seems to be ignorant that any others besides "the Antinomians" connect the satisfaction of Christ with the doctrine of the imputation of his *active* righteousness to believers," grows eloquent while he unfolds the Arminian theory and directs against a shadow those weapons which might be used with fatal effect against his own system. The Church-doctrine which widely differs from that of the Arminians, and, consequently, of the Methodists, teaches that while through the death of Christ, we are released from guilt and punishment, at the same time, through his virtue or obedience to the law during his life, as imputed to us, we are qualified to receive the reward of life eternal. It is established on passages like Matth. 5: 17; John 4: 34; 8: 29; Romans 5: 19; 8: 3, 4; 10: 4; Phil. 2: 8; 3: 9; Heb. 10: 7. The violence of the Socinians, Arminians and Rationalists, in impugning this doctrine, either accomplishes nothing, or is more destructive than it was designed by some

¹The gross errors of the Antinomians are rejected in Art. 6 of the Concord-Formula. See also, *ibid.* p. 714, ("Luther writes against the Antinomians" &c.) For an account of the Antinomian controversy, of Agricola, and of the firm position occupied by our Church in opposition to the dangerous views of the so-called Antinomians, we refer to the article of Thomasius in the last No. of this Review, p. 222 sq.

of them to be; that is, either the arguments directed against the imputation to the believer of Christ's *active* obedience are unsound, or they apply with equal force to the imputation to the believer of Christ's merits in any other sense and rob us of all hope of salvation through him. For, can we really assign an isolated position to his death, and divest his sinless life, his obedience, or his fulfilling of the law of all value? Without these essential features of his work, could his mere *suffering* of death constitute the work which he came to *do*? The apostle Paul, who regarded the incarnation and obedience of Christ, as parts of his mediatorial work, in his enlarged view of divine truth, comprehends even the resurrection as a part of that great work by which man is reconciled to God: Christ—he says, Rom. 4: 25,—was raised again for our justification. Commentators are agreed that our justification, in the theological sense of the term, is not the result exclusively of the resurrection; the apostle views *all* the obedience of Christ as mediatorial in its character, and this view alone will give harmony and power to various expressions that would otherwise appear to be either indistinct or contradictory. Thus, in the next chapter, he ascribes our justification to Christ's "blood," ch. 5: 9, and, in the following verse, our salvation to his "life." Thus, too, the earlier Symbol. books, adopting the more usual phraseology, give special prominence to the death of Christ; but before their completion, it was felt that this language did not express the *whole* truth, according to the strict requisitions of systematic theology, and hence the Concord-Formula presented the whole theory in its full development, in appropriate terms, and in strict accordance with the teachings of the Scriptures, and also with all the statements of the earlier symbols.¹ As the New Testament, with its more glorious revelations, beautifully harmonizes with the Old Testament, so the F. C., with its fuller statements, admirably explains and confirms the former Confessions. Since the active obedience of Christ, without his death, would not have been a full atonement, and since the latter constituted the most solemn feature of his whole work, the reasons for which a special importance is assigned to it in many passages of Scripture and of the Symb. Books may be easily understood, while such passages by no means intend to deny the meritorious character of other parts of his great

¹ Those writers who have vainly labored to discover a contradiction between the F. C. and the earlier Symbols on this point, have, in some cases, been influenced by motives as dishonest as those which actuated Strauss (Leben Jesu) in his unholy work of imagining contradictions between the several narratives of the Four Evangelists.

work. The Saviour could not have said: "I have *finished* the work," &c. John 17: 4, if it had not been even *commenced*—his active obedience had really been the beginning of that work, and its completion on the cross was near and certain when he uttered those words. A similar use of terms frequently occurs; for instance, if the five books of Moses are often called the "law," which is a distinguishing feature, still, that term does not deny that those books also contain history, doctrine, &c. Or if our church in France and elsewhere, as contradistinguished from Calvinistic or Reformed Protestants, is called the 'Church of the Augsburg Confession,'—a name which our older theologians often employed—such a designation is merely historical in its nature, implying that the A. C. was the first symbol of the church in point of time, by which Lutherans were known, and does not deny the validity or parity of rank of later Confessions. Precisely as the "children of Abraham," John 8: 39, are called the "children of Israel," the church of the A. C. might, with great propriety, be called after one of its most glorious treasures, *the Church of the Concord. Formula*. Thus, while the sufferings and death, or passive obedience of Christ, sustains our hopes, we gratefully appeal to his active obedience also, as a ground of our acceptance with God. *Christ is all our own*—his whole course was propitiatory in its nature, and the great work of the Atonement was not commenced, but "finished" on the cross.

We, further, believe, that Christ is our Mediator according to *both natures*. On our church-doctrine of the "two natures, the divine and the human, inseparably connected in the unity of the person," (A. C. Art. III.) it is not necessary to enlarge here, since it is well understood and acknowledged by orthodox denominations. While Osiander of Königsberg maintained, that Christ was our righteousness only according to his divine nature, his colleague Stancar held, that it was simply according to his human nature that Christ was our righteousness.¹ As a question of so grave a character, if left undecided,

¹ For a very clear exhibition of the Osiandrian errors, we again refer to the translation which the Editor of the *Ev. Review* furnished in the last No. (Oct. 1850, p. 225 sqq.) of an article by Thomasius. The freedom with which the latter expresses himself respecting the great work of G. J. Planck (*Gesch. d. protest. Lehrbegriffs*, 6 vols.) "who took pains to exercise impartiality towards all except the Lutherans," (p. 220), merits the attention of those who "regard him (Planck) as the highest authority, when he treats so slightly the Formula of Concord," (p. 222), and *who imitate him*. Köllner (*Symbolik*, I. 589), also, who respects the F. C. even if he concurs with Planck in supposing it to be "behind the age," remarks: "Planck ist nicht parteiisch gegen Catholiken und Reformirte, aber — gegen die Lutheraner!" He admits the high historic value of Planck's work, but laments the influ-

would have perpetually occasioned controversy, and cast a shadow on our faith, the F. C. here again introduced harmony and order; both opinions were rejected as erroneous, and the following positions, resting on the divine word were assumed by the church: "The sense in which Christ, in this question of justification, is called our righteousness, must be carefully noticed. Namely, our righteousness is founded neither on his divine, nor on his human nature, but on his whole person, since he, as God and man is our righteousness alone in his entire and most perfect obedience. For, even if Christ had been conceived of the Holy Ghost and born without sin, and in his human nature alone had fulfilled all righteousness, and yet had not been God, true and eternal, such obedience and suffering of his human nature could not be imputed to us for righteousness. And again, if the Son of God had not been made man, his divine nature could not be our righteousness. Wherefore, we believe, teach and confess, that the obedience, as a whole, of the whole person of Christ, which he rendered to the Father for our sakes, even to the most ignominious death of the cross, is imputed to us for righteousness. For his human nature alone, without the divine, would not have availed, by obedience or suffering, to satisfy the eternal and omnipotent God for the sins of the whole world. The divine nature alone, without the human, could not have performed the part of a Mediator between God and us, [being incapable of dying.] But since, as it was stated above, the obedience of Christ was not one nature alone, but of the whole person, it is therefore a most perfect satisfaction and expiation for the human race, by which satisfaction is rendered to that eternal

ence of his prejudices, by which he was led to do injustice to the Concord-Formula, and prevented from understanding the conduct of that noble man and profound theologian, Jacob Andrea, whom he flippantly terms the "lustly concord-maker from Suabia." On p. 686 Köllner gives references to some passages in Planck, which betray his jaundiced and sarcastic spirit. — We may here add an anecdote illustrative of the sagacity with which Luther could at once read the character of an individual. Andrew Osiander was remarkable not only for his varied learning, but also for his eloquence, but he was ambitious, obstinate, and even scurrilous in debate. It is said, that, on one occasion, when Luther had heard him deliver a discourse in Marburg, he turned, at its conclusion, to Melancthon and said: "Osiander has a proud spirit: he will cause much trouble in the Church after my death: bear this in mind, for you will live to see it." The prediction of Luther, like his doctrines, was absolute truth. — Francis Stancar, Professor of the Hebrew language in Königsberg, who had been commissioned by Albert of Prussia, to effect a reconciliation between Osiander and his opponents, unfortunately, divested himself of the character of a peace-maker, and adopted the passions of a partisan. He was led by the excitement of controversy to express doctrinal views diametrically opposed to those of Osiander, but equally unsound, and, ultimately, withdrew to Poland, where he died.

and immutable divine justice which is revealed in the law. That obedience is our righteousness," &c. F. C. p. 696. "We therefore reject these errors: I. That Christ is our righteousness before God, according to his divine nature alone; II, That he is our righteousness according to his human nature alone," &c. *ibid.* 697. "Christ is our Mediator, Redeemer, King, High-priest, Chief Shepherd, &c., not according to one nature, whether human or divine, but according to each nature," &c. *ibid.* p. 773.

These explicit declarations of the church are essential to a fair statement of the Lutheran doctrine, and while we heartily receive them, we do not apprehend that, at this late day, any sound scriptural exhibition of the doctrine of the Atonement will have any other result than that of establishing them.

All who recognize the authority of the Christian religion, alike acknowledge, that God possesses claims on man, and that the influence of Christ on our relations towards God have been salutary in the highest degree; but expressions less general and indefinite than these are, do not meet universal approbation. The Socinians differ widely from all others who confess Christ. In their view, Christ occupies the position of a wise and benevolent law-giver, whose death, merely as a demonstration of his sincerity and elevated principles, was quite a subordinate feature of his great work, or of his merits, for these, as they allege, properly consisted in the pure doctrines which he taught, and the holy example which he gave. Regarding Luther and his creed, doubtless, with the feelings which Rabshakeh expressed in reference to king Hezekiah and his creed, they declare our whole doctrine that Christ made a satisfactory atonement for our sins to be "fallacious, erroneous, contrary to Scripture, and very pernicious," (*Cat-Rac.* p. 268), and Christ's title to our gratitude arises solely from his doctrines, his example, his willingness to die, and his benevolent intentions; thus, while they profess that they regard his death as an event of vast importance, because it led to his own glorious resurrection, still, they divest it of its propitiatory character. If their peculiar system places them in the attitude of aliens, we can scarcely claim a greater affinity with the Greek Church. The Confessions of this communion admit, it is true, that the death of Christ was a propitiation, but they vitiate the truth by the adoption of erroneous views, which differ from many of those of the church of Rome only in being less unblushingly avowed. The latter adopts a system full of contradictions. The papist, discarding our own views, believes that the merit of Christ is actually superabundant, and

on it founds his whole lucrative system of indulgences ; again, while we believe, that by the influence of the merits of Christ, the guilt of both original sin and actual sins is removed in the case of the true believer, the papist, misguided by his lax views of human corruption, and by his Pelagian sentiments respecting human ability, limits the operation of Christ's atonement to original sin, and holds that, in the case of actual sins, our own merits or satisfaction must be added to the work of Christ, in order to win pardon for us. Such views were set forth by the Council of Trent, Sessio XIV, Cap. 8, and tended to establish the meritorious character of good works. It was, indeed, in reference to this point, in connection with canonical satisfactions, that, even in the earliest periods of the Reformation, our church came in conflict with the adherents of the Pope. While the Arminian, like the Papist, denies the entire efficacy of Christ's atonement, he rejects the remedy proposed by the latter ; the deficiency in the merits of Christ he supplies by assuming, that God received an imperfect atonement as equivalent to a full satisfaction for our sins, and leaves our objection unanswered, that, if, according to his principles, immutable justice might dispense with a large portion of the labors and sorrows which Christ endured, it might be content with even a less satisfaction than it did receive, or indeed, demand none at all.

While the orthodox Reformed Churches generally adopt our views respecting the sufficiency of the Atonement, a limitation of a peculiar kind is introduced into the Confessions of those which are governed by Calvinistic influences. The Westminster Confession, Chap. XI, 3, teaches, indeed, that "Christ, by his obedience and death, did fully discharge the debt of all those that are thus justified," &c., but, nevertheless, it teaches that only those whom God has predestinated, are effectually called to salvation by Jesus Christ, (X. 1), and expressly says : "Others not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet they never truly come to Christ, and therefore cannot be saved," *ibid.* X, 4. Such views are foreign to our system. The Episcopal Church,¹ originally governed by Lutheran influences, adopted, as far as it

¹ "But, as the government (of England) needed the support of the Protestants, so the Protestants needed the protection of the government. Much was therefore given up on both sides ; an union was effected ; and the fruit of that union was the Church of England. — The man who took the chief part in settling the conditions of the alliance which produced the Anglican Church was Thomas Cranmer. — Saintly in his professions, unscrupulous in his dealings, zealous for nothing, bold in speculation, a coward

ventures to speak, our doctrine, in Art. 31, of the "Thirty-nine Articles" in the following terms: "The offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone," &c. This seems intended to be a fuller statement than the Second Article contains. In the same article, and in the fourteenth, this confession also agrees with our own in rejecting the "Sacrifice of Masses" and "works of Supererogation." These portions have been transferred to the Methodist "Articles of Religion," and are adopted by the followers of Wesley without any change. Still, the two sects of the Episcopalians and the Methodists occupy positions which are left unguarded in a surprising manner. Our own views are so fully defined, and our whole system is so complete, so harmonious with itself, and so purely scriptural, that if many in Germany departed at one time from the faith, the conservative influences of our Confessions tend, by the blessing of God, to restore the purity of doctrine; the day is not far distant, when the reproaches now cast on the Church in Germany, will cease to be even partially deserved, and when the church will render practical honor to our Symbols by the victory of the orthodox faith which they will achieve. But when the meagre creeds of other religious bodies, like the "Thirty-nine Articles," are once abandoned, their feeble cry will never be effectual in reclaiming wanderers; interpretations of Scripture, that are new and false, but agreeable to human pride, will prevail and remain permanently, owing to the absence of the counterbalancing influence of sound and full confessions of faith. Hence

and a timeserver in action, a placable enemy and a lukewarm friend, he was in every way qualified to arrange the terms of the coalition between the religious and the worldly enemies of Popery. To this day the constitution, the doctrines and the services of the Church, retain the visible marks of the compromise from which she sprung. She occupied a middle position between the churches of Rome and Geneva," &c. Macaulay's History of England, Chap. I. — This historian, who seems to us to be making an effort to conceal the sarcastic mood in which he writes on the origin of the Episcopal Church, (its doctrines made to depend on policy, &c. and not on the decisions of the Bible!) omits, in the rapid sketch which he gives, all reference to the Lutheran source, from which proceeded the only elements of health and vigor possessed by the offspring of the *mésalliance* described in these extracts. Possibly, it occurred to his mind, that the child of parents brought together, not by holy affections, but by selfish interest, having, late in life, been taught the Catechism by Puseyism, and furnished with no better clothing than "rags of popery," might well draw forth expressions of pity rather than of indignation, when it amuses itself by consigning its "dis-senting brethren to the uncovenanted mercies," &c.

when a general defection from the faith occurs in any church except our own, it is not probable that such a church will easily return to the religion of the Bible; the rays of light which it does possess will be extinguished by new sects, such as our church cannot possibly bring forth. We can, in our day, as little expect miracles in the moral as in the physical world. The husbandman, who casts away the seed which the Lord gave him, will find no good grain growing by a miracle in the field which should have been cultivated by his own labor and care.

The Baptists, whom we have not hitherto introduced, seem to maintain so little union among themselves, except in the fact that they *immerse* or *dip*, but never *baptize* in the Scriptural mode, that, as we might have *à priori* expected, they have no sympathies with us. Indeed, the few points of affinity which might, with some labor, be discovered, are lost in the chasm opened by their exclusive spirit between themselves and others.

It is difficult to define the position of the very numerous Congregational churches of New England, &c. The "Independent," published in New York, one of the ablest periodicals of the Congregationalists, in a recent article (August 1, 1850), denies that their churches, at least in New York, "have any common symbol or standard of faith. . . . Each Congregational church has its own confession of faith, as is true of most of the churches in New England. But, (adds the writer from whom we quote,) there is a *quasi* symbol of the churches at large in the Articles of Faith of the General Association of the State (of New York)." This symbol, consisting of fourteen Articles is then given in full. The following, appropriate in this connection, is Art. 7.: "The Lord Jesus Christ, who is both God and man in one person, has, by his sufferings and death, made a complete atonement for all mankind, and thereby laid the foundation for the offer of a free and full pardon, which is made indiscriminately to all, on the condition of repentance for sin, and faith in Christ." Even if we were disposed to give a favorable construction to this "foundation" &c. and to withdraw our objections to a term (foundation) so loose that even consistent Socinians readily adopt it, (for there is not, apparently, an allusion to 1 Corinth. 3: 11, where Christ *himself* is said to *be* the foundation) still, we would be deterred, when, in Art. 9, we are told that "God has, in the covenant of redemption, given to Christ *a part* of mankind, who were from all eternity predestinated" &c. The Scriptural doctrine of the Atonement, disrobed of its splendor, here ap-

pears so insignificant, and is so plainly vitiated by its admixture with Calvinism, as to compel us to adopt the conclusion, that New York and New England Congregationalism is essentially at variance with Lutheran principles. We sincerely regret this circumstance. The admiration which we, otherwise, entertain for this body of Christians is justified by the distinguished position attained by many of their pastors, the high rank to which many of the professors of their colleges and theological seminaries have risen, as teachers and authors, and the streams of benevolence which have flowed from their churches.

Indeed, none of the religious denominations to which we have referred, present the doctrine of the Atonement in a form so fully developed, and so strictly Scriptural as our own.— Their creeds are so general, so indefinite, so fearful of adopting emphatic language, that they present divine truth in a diluted rather than in a concentrated form. We regret, that all those to which we have had occasion to refer, are invariably characterized, either by the introduction of erroneous views that produce unsoundness in the whole doctrine, or by the omission of essential features, the effect of which is to destroy its integrity. Happily, our own creeds, which at an earlier period enlightened the Protestant world, still remain as guides and examples. Let us be faithful to them, and thank God for them. It would indeed be a “day of trouble and of rebuke” (Isaiah 37: 3) in the history of the Church in America, in which those who are prepared to receive the creed of the Bible with unprejudiced and intelligent minds, and who have *actually read* the Concord-Formula, would begin to speak of it in unfriendly and disparaging terms.

The limits, however, which we assigned to this article, have long since been reached — and, indeed, we could not pursue this subject without entering the bounds of doctrines (justification — predestination, &c.) which, from their importance, claim a more extended notice, than our space permits us to give them. The present remarks, may, however, serve to exhibit the value, not merely of the earlier symbols, but also of the Concord-Formula, which cannot be disrupted from our established Creeds without essential loss. Our fellow-Christians of other names we love; we live in delightful union with them; our harmony in social life, in benevolent operations, &c. is perfect. We are not, however, so completely controlled by a morbid desire for “union,” as to suppress a single doctrinal statement which our Confessions contain. If the Church, according to the representations which we have given, seriously

differs from many religious denominations, even *they* could scarcely ask us to promote "Christian Union" by abandoning a truth which we prize as a gift of God. Let concessions come from those who arose long after our system was developed and proved to be, in all its features, God's own truth. Let these concessions come from those who first created *disunion* by the introduction of doctrines, which, because they were unsound, necessarily entered into conflict with our own. We would expect no favorable results from any "Evangelical Alliance" of different sects, which would require the Lutheran Church to abandon any of her doctrines. Could God's blessing rest on any plan of union which would demand of the Church even nothing more than *silence* respecting any part of the very truth, which, through his servant Luther, he restored to the world in all its divine fulness and splendor? Can any one of our Symbolical Books be abandoned without a sacrifice of God's truth? We may well tremble for the ark of God, when unholy hands begin to despoil it of its consecrated treasures. There is solemn truth in the words of Nicholas Selnecker, one of the associates of Chancellor Andreä in preparing the Concord-Formula for publication, even if the vernacular idiom of his day and its orthography were more homely than they are in our age: "Wir können dessen gewiss seyn, dass, so lange man in diesen und andern Landen, Kirchen und Schulen *über dieser Bekänntniss und Erklärung*, so in dem Christlichen Concordien-Buch verfasst, halten wird, so lange werde auch Richtigkeit in Gottes Wort, oder in der Lehre, ohne Schwermerey, neben andern Seegen Gottes, bey uns seyn und bleiben. So bald aber von demselben richtigen Bekänntniss wird in geringsten abgesetzt werden, dass auch Gott, der uns diese grosse Wolthat noch zu letzt erzeiget hat, von uns absetzen, und allerley Lästung und Schwermerey unter uns einreissen lassen werde."

ARTICLE II.

ANTIQUITY, AND THE CHURCH-FATHERS.

By Prof. H. I. Schmidt, D. D., New York.

THE propensity of mankind to go to extremes finds ample scope for exercise in the present age, in which, both in the field of speculation and in the multiform pursuits of active life, the spirit of unrest, of daring enterprize, of reckless experiment, of headlong action, of boundless covetousness, pre-

vails in all the affairs of men. The excessive activity displayed in our age, in every human concern, is productive both of good and of evil results; but to examine and discuss these is not our present purpose. The greatest evil connected with the developments of modern "progressiveness," is the ultraism in thought or theory, and in practical affairs, every where exhibited in men's style of living, in politics, in literature, in religion. The church feels to her innermost centre the effects of what the present century fondly regards as its great and imperative law of progress: a law conceived to be organic to the living and the coming age; — and that she has derived some great benefits from its influence on the mind and life of man, it would be foolish to deny. Whether these benefits are really to be sought, where men generally imagine that they find them, is a point open to question, but not to be here debated. But, whatever advantages the church may have derived from the supposed progressive tendency of the age, no thoughtful mind can doubt, that the same cause has inflicted upon her unspeakable injuries. As all is not gold that glitters, so neither is every movement which, with great parade, bustle and noise, announces as its motto: "go ahead," necessarily, or justly, to be regarded as progress. Men, who make too much haste to climb a slippery steep, are very likely to slip backward two, or even six feet, to every step they venture forward; nay, are very apt to lose their footing entirely, and to arrive, with most awkward dispatch, at the bottom, instead of at the top, of "the hill of difficulty." And furthermore, every extreme movement in one direction will inevitably provoke and produce its extreme opposite. Thus has it been in the church in divers respects that might be specified. We shall instance only a few. The excessive rigors of Puritanism, in sundry particulars, evoked the laxities, confessional and disciplinarian, of Unitarianism, whose religious mantle is wide enough to cover and shelter almost every variety of liberal opinion, nearly every shade of latitudinarian doctrine. The frigid torpor and slothful formalism of the Anglican establishment gave rise to certain fanatical developments, operations, and movements, which have swept, like a tornado, over the churches of our own land, in which a stagnation, that had gradually supervened, demanded a violent commotion for the purification of the vitiated elements. The same is true as respects the subject, which at present more particularly claims our attention. The inflated and self-sufficient spirit of ultra-protestantism, which held nothing sacred of which it could not perceive the *quomodo* and the *cui bono*, of which it could not explain the rationale,

and point out the utility, has presumed to condemn utterly the wisdom, to reject entirely the authority, of antiquity : to cast away that reverence and deference which are due to the early fathers of the church, to deny the sacredness and value of forms and institutions which have come down to us from the olden time, and to set up for itself in the exercise of unbounded congregational independence, to the total denial and abrogation of all authority in the church and her divinely appointed ministry ; and this extreme of Protestant liberalism has led, in the church of England, and the Episcopal church of this country, to the extreme opposite developments of Puseyism, to an excessive regard for whatever is ancient, and an absolute, unquestioning submission to the authority of tradition and of the church. Here, as elsewhere, the right and safe path lies in the middle between the two extremes : "*in medio tutissimus ibis.*" The claims of enlightened reason, the prerogatives of private judgment, when modestly urged and temperately enforced, are not to be authoritatively set aside, and haughtily scorned, under the pretence, that antiquity has long since settled what we are to believe and practice, and that the human understanding must, without inquiry, acquiesce in the decisions of the church, and bow submissive to the authority of her dignitaries, resigning to them the right of defining for all others the rule of faith and practice. But equally wrong and pernicious is the opposite assumption, so popular, and so generally acted upon at the present day, that the church and her ministry have no authority beyond what each individual, in his self-sufficient wisdom, may be willing to concede, and that the symbols and institutions of antiquity, the opinions and decisions of the fathers of the church are of no account whatever to the free inquiries, the mature thinkers, the profound theologians, the acute reasoners, the intelligent and liberal christians, of this enlightened age ; that it matters nothing whatever to us, what those who lived in the days of the Apostles and in the ages immediately succeeding, declared to be the doctrines, the usages and the discipline of the church. That such is really the position of the great mass of Protestant christendom, will, however strongly we may be thought to have stated the case, plainly appear to every reflecting mind, which attentively reads and candidly weighs the views that are published, week after week, by the periodical religious press. The subject presents itself to us under a variety of phases, each of which it would be interesting minutely to examine, and separately to discuss. But there is one general view of it, which has of late found many staunch adherents,

and some very strenuous advocates in our own church, and which is therefore to us of special interest. It has been avowed in various forms, and proclaimed in divers connexions, and is becoming so imperious, dictatorial and overbearing, that to pass it by entirely unnoticed, might bring upon those, who are known to differ from its advocates, the charge of pusillanimity. We shall refrain from specifying any particular sources whence our information is derived, and merely state, in general terms, the position which has been, of late, so broadly and strongly taken.

It is contended, then, that, at this advanced stage of human culture, the views of the church-fathers are of no importance or weight whatever, and that altogether the authority of antiquity is null: = 0: it is maintained, gravely and solemnly asseverated, that the meanest capacity in the church of the present day has a clearer insight into divine truth, a more comprehensive and better understanding of the great doctrines of the Gospel, than the fathers could, by any possibility, have possessed; and finally, to give antiquity its coup-de-grace,—its deathblow, it is strenuously insisted, that we, who live in this enlightened nineteenth century, are the fathers, whereas those who have heretofore surreptitiously borne that appellation are, in reality, the children, fit only, if now living, to sit at our feet, and to drink in the lessons of wisdom that flow from our lips, and are distilled, like dew, from our patent steel-pens. This we conceive to be a fair and moderate statement of the views, of late so often and so broadly advanced, in various forms, in divers connexions, and for sundry purposes. In accordance with this opinion, those, who take a different view of the subject, those who acknowledge and admire the learning, and respect the wisdom, and render deference to the judgment of the fathers, are either ridiculed as anile weaklings, or summarily denounced as Puseyites. It would be more to the credit of these wise scholars of the nineteenth century, if, in the place of ridicule and denunciation, they were to use argument, and, by furnishing evidence that they have studied and comprehended the writings of the fathers, show that they really understand the subject, respecting which they so positively affirm.

Ere we proceed to any further discussion in the premises, we have yet two statements to premise: 1, for reasons which will be obvious to most of our readers, we shall, in speaking of the fathers, have regard not only to those ordinarily and strictly so called, but specially also to those of our own church,

to Luther and his coadjutors, and, at the same time, pass in review the claims to consideration belonging to antiquity in general. 2. For the view which has been stated to prevail extensively at the present day, relative to the subject under consideration, we have never seen any other reason whatever given, save this, that we live so many centuries later:—that, in addition to the knowledge possessed by the fathers, we have the advantage of the accumulated stores, of the ever-progressing discoveries of eighteen centuries:— that we must, of necessity, know more and understand better, than ever the fathers did or could, simply because the world is so much older now than it was in their day, and because the discoveries of science, made since their day, are already immense and constantly increasing. If any other argument has ever been advanced in behalf of the opinion which we are to examine, we frankly acknowledge our ignorance of it: we have never seen any. And we do not know that we can do better than to commence our discussion, by taking this argument, in respect of its logical value, as our first point.

We have never seen any proposition more susceptible of the *reductio ad absurdum*, than this which is advanced by recent writers against the authority of the fathers, or of antiquity in general. Let then our readers bear in mind that, according to the logic of our modern dialecticians, views of divine truth, of Scripture-doctrine, are valuable, worthy of consideration and deference, just in proportion as they are remote in their development from the age of the fathers, and that the least cultivated minds of the nineteenth century must necessarily be vastly superior in intelligence and wisdom to the strongest minds, the brightest intellects, the most learned heads of antiquity, simply and solely because they live eighteen or fourteen centuries later than the latter. The argument is complete in itself: it speaks for itself: it needs no further expansion; and we are ready for the inferences which may legitimately, nay which must be consistently, deduced from it; or rather, for the consequences which must inevitably result from its strict and consistent application. Let us then apply. The Unitarianism of New England is, by its advocates, strenuously asserted, and with much ingenuity and learning argued, to be the only correct scheme of gospel-truth, and possessed of the only sound and just principle on which the Scriptures of the New Testament can be correctly interpreted. This wonderful discovery, however, belongs to the eighteenth century, in which the human mind had not yet acquired all the lights which illumine the current century; and as it may, therefore, be re-

garded as somewhat behind the age, we can no longer venture to commend it to the acceptance of those whose views we are ventilating. Following, therefore, in the wake of human progress in wisdom and enlightenment, we again advance a step, and plant our foot on another grand and glorious discovery in the realms of truth. American Universalism, as it is well known to our readers in all its monstrous distortions of truth, and its utter repudiation of sound principle, is a child of the nineteenth century, and is, by its friends and advocates, declared to be directly and faithfully derived from the sacred Scriptures. They maintain, that until their illustrious leaders undertook to enlighten mankind, christians were deluded and gulled by stupid fire and brimstone theorists, blind leaders of the blind; and that their sagacious and profoundly learned divines alone understand how to interpret and expound correctly the word of God. According to the doctrines of those who repudiate the authority of the fathers, these Universalist expositors of the sacred oracles are worthy of all possible respect, credit and deference—at least until some new grand modern discovery has again superseded theirs—for do they not claim to be the only true exponents of the accumulated wisdom of ages,—and do they not live eighteen centuries later than Ignatius, Polycarp and Tertullian, and about fifteen later than Jerome and Augustine?

But this new grand discovery is not awanting:—indeed it has been made so many years ago, that Unitarianism and Universalism are quite old-fashioned and obsolete, and that we only wonder why the next great forward stride in human progress has not long since been taken. We would humbly suggest, as the only probable explanation, that human ingenuity and wisdom “can no farther go.” However this may be, the discovery here spoken of was made by a great German philosopher; and it was arrived at by profound study, by the keen inspection, analysis and classification of facts, by the acute critical examination of historical records, and by sagacious induction from one of the most magnificent foregone conclusions ever concocted by a human brain; and it is this: that the Gospel-history is a myth; that Jesus Christ is a mythological phantasm, constructed and conglutinated out of sundry vague and floating traditions; that miracles are impossible, and that the great scheme of human redemption is all a piece of trumpery patchwork, fit only to cover and make comfortable the infantile ignorance of the early church-fathers, and utterly unworthy the regard or notice of the intellectual Goliaths and

Samsons of this enlightened age. Here then is a discovery calculated to throw the admirers of modern enlightenment and wisdom into convulsions of delight and ecstasy. Its grand defect is, that it is only negative: it has been reached by a process of demolition and destruction. We stand, therefore, all agape, ready to take at a gulp the next grand development of the learning, and wisdom and intellectual power of the nineteenth century; to wit, the promulgation of an entirely new system of religion (provided we are really to be allowed any religion at all, which is by no means probable), which shall sweep every vestige of christianity from the face of the earth, and conduct mankind to the summit of intelligence, of moral excellence, and of sublunary bliss. According to the principles laid down by our opponents of the fathers, we are bound to receive, and to glory in, all these grand discoveries of modern times, and to look, with eager expectation, for still greater triumphs of the modern mind. We are bound to go forward with the spirit of the age; and the farther we get away from the fathers, the better. We are not dealing unfairly with those whose views we combat. They have laid down, without qualification, a broad principle, by which they judge, a general criterion according to which they estimate the relative importance and value of the ancients and moderns: for the sake of argument we grant them their postulate, and merely apply it as it must be applied. If they intend to maintain the ground which they have taken, that intelligence and wisdom necessarily increase in proportion to remoteness from antiquity, and that, at the present day, the meanest capacity has a clearer and better understanding of the great truths of religion than the fathers can have had, merely because we live eighteen or fourteen centuries later than they did, it is perfectly evident that they are in quite as awkward a predicament as those who go to the opposite extreme, and who accept and believe any and every doctrine, however erroneous or absurd, merely because it is some sixteen or seventeen centuries old, and because it was promulgated by one of the early fathers, or sanctioned by some old pope. Both, in order to be consistent, are equally bound to endorse the various developments either of antiquity, or of modern times, according to the position which they have respectively taken. But to do this is, as we have already seen, purely an outrage upon conscience and common sense, and involves, not one absurdity, but any conceivable number of absurdities. And therefore no such position will ever be taken by any calmly reflecting, unbiassed man: it can be taken only in the heat of party-spirit, and of controversy.

And we know very well that we shall here be met by a most earnest disclaimer. Those who so utterly repudiate the authority of the fathers, and regard with such intense and unqualified admiration the superior intelligence and wisdom of this enlightened and progressive century, will tell us, that they accept and approve the discoveries and progressive developments of our brilliant age, only inasmuch as they are evolved upon a true and sound basis, and go forward in a right direction. But what do this disclaimer and this declaration amount to? Obviously to a simple and total abandonment of the ground which they have taken against the fathers. For, let it be remembered those shocking opinions, those monstrous doctrinal developments, which we have called upon our anti-patristic friends to accept and endorse, in accordance with the broad principle, which they have, again and again, openly avowed, are all claimed to be the only just and true and sound results of correct Scripture-interpretation, or, in the last mentioned instance, of the only proper estimate of the Scriptures themselves, and of contemporaneous history. If then modern philological criticism and modern speculation and dogmatism can make the Sacred Word say any and every thing that sectarians, heretics, or philosophers please, how are we to determine whether men *are* on the true foundation, and advancing in the right direction? How are we to convince errorists, how are we to obtain the conviction ourselves, that our principles of criticism, that our hermeneutics, our doctrinal expositions, are sounder, more worthy of acceptance and deference? Simply by an appeal to antiquity, and to the *ὁμολογεῖν* of the church from the apostolic age; by a careful study of archaeology in its various departments — of things as familiar as their household furniture to those much despised and reviled ancients — nay, of the very writings of these condemned fathers, as among the most important aids in the exposition of the Scriptures. For what else is criticism¹ but a close, searching, often painfully laborious study of things ancient; of ancient languages, of ancient history, of ancient manners, and customs, and institutions: what is it, but the cautious and judicious application of knowledge, of facts obtained, of principles or rules derived, by means of such earnest and faithful search and inquiry after things, with which those whom so many moderns affect to despise, were, from their very position, intimately acquainted even from childhood; with respect to which we na-

¹ Considered as dealing with the Sacred Scriptures, with the Greek and Roman Classics, &c.

turally and necessarily expect them to impart to us much valuable information ; in the study of which we must, whether we will or not, take them as our instructors and guides.

Thus then the opponents of the Fathers, by the disclaimer and avowal which we suppose them to make, are encroaching upon the ground which *we* occupy ; and as *they*, by their own showing, have no right to be here, we must beg them to take themselves off from *our* premises, until they shall have abandoned the unlimited proposition, with which they seek to annihilate, at a blow, the authority of the fathers.

We have thus shown, that the sweeping proposition so stoutly maintained, of late, by a number of writers in our midst, is clearly susceptible of the *reductio ad absurdum* ; that, whatever *may* be alleged against the fathers, the argument, which these modern dialecticians advance against them, is, at all events, good for nothing. If it proves any thing at all, it proves vastly too much : if it really have the weight which is claimed for it, it lays those who employ it, and rely upon it, under obligations to receive and endorse all the contradictory and conflicting developments and results of what is so loudly vaunted as modern enlightenment and progress. The opponents of the fathers need not tell us, that they are not willing to do any such thing : we know that very well. But while they profess to adhere to their unlimited proposition, we have a right to hold them to it, and shall insist upon their keeping to it faithfully. Until they openly renounce it, we shall expect them to keep it for better or for worse, with all its legitimate offspring. We flatter ourselves that we have already done something more than expose the absurdity of their reasoning ; but the point here referred to must be reserved for further discussion on a subsequent page. Our object, thus far, has merely been to show, that the proposition advanced and defended by our misopatrists is false in theory. Their reasoning, brought into a syllogism, stands thus : People who live fourteen or fifteen or seventeen centuries after the Fathers must, of necessity, for this reason and no other, know vastly, incalculably more than the Fathers could by any possibility know, concerning the sacred Scriptures and the doctrines of the Gospel ; we live so many centuries later than the Fathers : therefore we know incalculably more than the Fathers could have known. Handsomely done, to be sure ; but, the premises being wrong, the conclusion, of course, goes for nothing.

But, if the sweeping proposition which we are now considering is false in its theory and its reasoning ; *it is equally false*

in its assumed facts. Let us examine it from this point of view; and, as the argument, if it were worth any thing, would apply to antiquity in general with equal force as to the christian fathers, we shall take the liberty to inspect it in this comprehensive scope. And here it will be found that our antiquity-contemning friends are, like a certain British statesman, indebted to their imagination for their facts. It is then assumed to be a fact, indisputable and impregnable, that we moderns are so vastly in advance of the ancients, so immeasurably superior to them in knowledge, wisdom, skill, and savoir vivre, that to institute a comparison is quite preposterous, and that to acknowledge and submit to the authority of the ancients in any thing, would be a degree of imbecility, an extent of childishness, not to be tolerated for one moment. Still we venture seriously to propound the question, whether this assumed superiority of the moderns has any real foundation in fact? And, whatever admissions we may be disposed hereafter to make, we shall, for the present, be presumptuous enough to answer the question by a general denial, and to put a query in return: *In what particulars* is the present century superior to antiquity? Dropping all figures of rhetoric, which are very good in their place, can you give us the Arabian figures, the tangible specifications? We should really like to see your catalogue of modern perfections. But, let us proceed to specifications, and come to particulars, and gather up such facts as history affords. Let us begin with general affairs. First, then, does the present age better understand, and more successfully apply, the science of government, more effectually practise the art τὰ πολιτικά πράττειν, than did the ancients? So far as our own democracy, with its fearful and growing corruptions, is concerned, we have only to reply, that we had better wait a while longer before we quite make up our minds as to our superiority to the republics of Greece and Rome: the less said about the matter at present, the better. As for the governments (so called, we presume, by courtesy) of South America, Central America, and Mexico, really we must be excused from even looking at them. But, if we go to enlightened Europe, what enrapturing exhibitions of the art of government shall we there discover! In England with its pampered aristocracy, its down-trodden working-classes, its hideous mass of pauperism, and its Ireland: in Spain with its ridiculous court, its contemptible factions, and its inextricable confusion: in France, with its countless experiments, its numberless political isms, its unprofitable revolutions, and its dandy President: in Bavaria with its Lola Montes loving sovereign:

in Austria with its Metternich and more recently with its Haynau: in Prussia with its religious intolerance and its constitutions in paulo post futuro: in Russia with its knout-administering autocrat ruling over hosts of lying and gambling nobles, and millions of abject serfs: in the Papal States, the so-called centre and capital of Christendom, of whose delectable administration of the principles of government the Westminster Review published, in 1845, a most astounding expose. We could thus instance other governments of Europe, or go into interminable details relative to the shocking abuses, and corruptions, and oppressions of those which have been instanced; but we have neither space nor inclination to expatiate on a subject so extensive and so nauseating, and shall leave it to our readers to strike the balance between Solomon and others at Jerusalem, Solon, Pisistratus, Aristides, Cimon, Pericles and others in Athens; Augustus, Trajan, the Antonines, Theodosius and others at Rome, among the ancients, and our modern worthies, whether sitting upon thrones, or in congress assembled. But we shall be told that, if we have not perfection, we have progress. As regards our own country we shall have discretion enough to say nothing. As respects Europe, we there see two great tendencies: monarchism — absolute monarchies, with their standing armies, and their swarms of rapacious officials, restored, reëstablished: is this progress forward or backward? Radicalism, Socialism, Red-republicanism, repudiating religion and every genuine virtue, aiming at the subversion of social institutions, order and happiness, at the overthrow of the church, at the introduction of anarchy, and the establishment of savage life with all its license: — is this progress? Then from all such progress may we be effectually preserved and delivered!

But again: perhaps the present century has immeasurably outstripped the ancients in training the young: in its knowledge and application of the principles of education. On this subject we have books, octavos and duodecimos without number; and if actual education in practice were at all commensurate to the amount and size of the books written *about* it, a naughty child, a disobedient, refractory, disorderly youth, would deserve a place in some great museum, as a *rara avis* in terris. But, alas for education! We have no space to bestow upon Europe: those who desire to enlighten themselves may do so by reading in Vol. I. of Menzel's German Literature, from p. 279 to 352. As respects our own country we admit, that there is an immense amount of *teaching* going on in colleges, academies, and common schools; but when we inquire concerning

education, the education of home, the education effected by public sentiment and the countless influences abroad in society: when we consider that we are nominally a christian people, professing to reverence and obey the word of God, we are filled with amazement and sorrow. It is, indeed, admitted by all soberminded observers, that, if we except those families in which the duties enjoined by religion are truly respected and conscientiously observed, there is very little real education among us; that parental and every other species of authority are rapidly declining, or already down to zero; that we have no more children and youth, but that babies jump at once into man and womanhood; and that, at least, a little gentle moral suasion must be employed in place of the ancient *patria potestas*. The consequences of this general recreancy to the most important of domestic duties are manifest on every hand. We have unspeakably more respect for the educational principles and methods of the ancient Jews, of early Greece and Rome, and of some other nations of antiquity, than for the pitiful moral suasion-operations of the present day, which, as we constantly see with our own eyes, and hear with our own ears, are treated with universal and deserved contempt by those, upon whom they are designed to be brought to bear. We do think, that our modern progress-men might derive some benefit from studying the writings upon education of Xenophon, Aristotle, Plato, Pythagoras, Cicero, Seneca and others. But above all, let the extravagant admirers of the present age and its immense superiority over the ancients, inquire whether the manner in which the early church carried out the principles of education inculcated by the Bible, was not vastly more effectual, more beneficially effectual in the production of most delightful results, than the loose and feeble methods now in vogue, and whether it would not be better to restore, in the place of our modern moral suasion, the good old rules of Solomon respecting the efficacy of the rod.

But again: shall we be told, that at least and at all events in *philosophy*, modern times are immeasurably in advance of antiquity? By no manner of means. If in politics and education there is positively desperate confusion, surely in philosophy the age outbabels Babel. The fact is, that the modern systems, which are almost innumerable, are, in a great measure, little more than rifaccimentos and expansions of the many conflicting systems of the ancients: among them even the atomic theory, which has, of late, been making so distinguished a figure, is to be found, in all essential principles, in the physical doctrine of Epicurus. We are prepared to render

all due honor to Lord Bacon, that prince of empiric philosophizers, who exposed the barrenness and fallacies of former methods of reasoning, and taught men *how* to think, but constructed no system of philosophy. Through the rigid application of his inductive method, in physics, in natural science generally, and in psychology, the moderns have made real progress, far beyond all the discoveries of the ancients. But as respects positive results, this progress is predicable, as we shall hereafter insist, chiefly of the detection, elucidation and classification of the facts and laws of the material universe, of the discovery of mental and moral phenomena, and of the distinction, definition, and classification of the various faculties of the human mind, according to their different operations, as indicated by the consciousness of the inquirer directing his observation inward, or eliminated by generalizations derived from phenomena observed in a multitude of other individuals—in the race at large. But, regarding philosophy as the science of the absolute, we can only say with Menzel: "There are many systems of philosophy, because there can be no philosophy, that is, no philosophy absolutely valid; and these systems are merely methods of philosophizing, because they are made what they are, not by the end, but by the means." And here we should really like to know, what modern philosophers have accomplished more than the ancients, in the actual attainment of positive, and permanently satisfactory results. That their speculations have an immense value as explorations, as expanding and illumining the world of thought, as revealing the emptiness of many stately structures, and as tending to set aside many obsolete notions, and to settle a multitude of preliminary principles, we are not in the least disposed to deny. But if they have really settled, better than ancients, the great aims which it is the aim of philosophy to solve, how is it that system constantly and rapidly follows system, each proving its predecessor wrong; and that the last system which electrified Europe, is the most outrageously absurd, the most infamously blasphemous of all? We cannot here afford space for even a glance at the ancient schools; but if the great thinkers of antiquity failed, as they certainly did, to attain those great ends which the philosopher is ever striving after, and if this has really been any better accomplished by the moderns, we should like our despisers of antiquity to put the finger upon the system, in which these positive, and satisfactory results have been reached and promulgated. Do they find then in the Rationalism of Des Cartes,—in the so-called Ethic of the pantheist Spinoza,—in the Rationalism or Optim-

ism of Leibnitz,—in Kant's philosophical method, called the critical philosophy,—in the rigid Idealism of Fichte,—in Schelling's Identitäts-system, or philosophy of the absolute,—in Hegel's Encyclopedia of the philosophical sciences,—in the mysticism of Görres,—in Locke's philosophical sensualism,—in Hume's skepticism,—in Reid's Inquiry into the human mind on the principles of common sense? We have named only a tithe, only the most prominent of the modern systems, of which the three last mentioned scarcely pretend to be systems of *philosophy proper*; if those of the ancients are dry cisterns, those of recent times are hard rocks, against which we strike in vain, hoping that streams of positive, satisfactory truth will gush forth. They all have a certain value, greater or less, as tentative experiments: but, when the old and the new are weighed against each other, as respects positive, substantial and permanently valid results, the scales, we fancy, stand pretty well poised.

There are other departments of science, in respect of which it would be easy to show, that the contemptuous sneers, with which the trumpeters of modern superiority are wont to speak of the ancients, are equally misapplied; but we must forbear. It remains, however, to turn the tables, and to insist upon what every scholar knows, to wit: that in sundry branches of science and art, in various departments of human culture, in divers arrangements, institutions and pursuits, connected with the interests, the rational enjoyment and the adornment of this earthly life, the ancients were immeasurably superior to the moderns, and have served the generations which succeeded them, and will serve all coming generations, as models. We cannot enter into detail, however tempting the theme: we must be content with a few hints. As respects physical training and corporeal exercise, their methods were in the utmost degree effectual, whereof the results achieved are conclusively demonstrative: their plan for the public education of youth deserves the serious attention of modern republics: in eloquence, in historic writing, in poetry of every description, they are unrivalled models for all succeeding ages, originating and perfecting what others can only imitate, and hope to approximate: in several of the fine arts, especially architecture and sculpture,¹ they remain unequalled, having attained that ab-

¹ We are well aware of the extraordinary skill which the Greeks attained in painting and music; but we advisedly omit naming these arts above, because in painting they scarcely equalled, in life and brilliancy of coloring, the moderns; and because we know very little concerning their music. The

solute perfection, which cannot be excelled and belongs to them alone; and it is well known that they were highly skilled in several arts which passed away with them, defying all subsequent attempts to re-discover them. And when it is borne in mind, that classical studies are the chief element in modern liberal culture; that, for centuries past, the most gifted and accomplished scholars have devoted, and still continue to devote, their lives to the critical and profoundly searching study, the elaborate explanation and elucidation of the writings of the ancients; that the most illustrious characters in the republic of letters were either students and commentators of the Greek and Roman classics, or fitted, by a thorough and loving study of their writings, for their own attainment of literary distinction, the manner in which many modern writers presume to talk of the merits and authority of the ancients, becomes positively ludicrous.

But it is time that we turn to what at present more particularly concerns us, the falsehood of the allegation, that modern theologians, nay the meanest capacities in the church of our day, do really possess a clearer and better understanding of the doctrines of the Gospel, than did the Fathers of the Church. This assumption is one truly monstrous, involving sundry (as we have seen) absurdities, and some downright abominations: it is one that can be soberly advanced only by those who have some theory to support, some foregone conclusion to bolster up, like that which we are now considering, viz: that we must, of necessity, be more knowing and wiser than the Fathers, because we live so many centuries later than they. Now we are, by no means, of the number of those who value institutions, and adopt opinions or doctrines, for no other reason than because they are old, redolent with the odor of antiquity: we are resolved to abide by the Scriptural rule, to "prove all things, and hold fast that which is good;" and we are not at all disposed or anxious to deny that the church-fathers were liable to err, that some of them fell into serious errors, and ran into various speculative and practical vagaries. But, while we admit this of the fathers, their opponents have effectually deprived themselves of the right of making any such admission relative to modern theologians and christians; if they adhere consistently to their unlimited propositions, they must hold, that among the superlatively enlightened moderns,

effects ascribed to it are altogether wonderful, so that the conclusion is reasonable that, both in melody and harmony, the Greek musicians had acquired uncommon power and skill. But we forbear to mention in the text any thing respecting which we have any doubt.

errors in doctrine and practice are nearly or quite impossible. If they cannot hold this, we cannot see what their sweeping propositions, and the many arguments based upon them, are good for. And we can hardly keep serious, while we ask them, whether they are prepared to approve and accept *all* the dogmatical systems, *all* the expositions of Scripture, of *all* the theologians, of exalted or of mean capacity, of the nineteenth century: or, if not, whether they will point out, by name, that one particular modern theologian, whose every opinion concerning doctrine and practice, they are willing to endorse? Where and who is the man? Is it Bretschneider, De Wette, Ammon, Reinhardt, Paulus, Röhr, Fritzsche, Olshausen, Ullmann, Umbreit, Schleiermacher, Twisten, Guericke, Neander, Tholuck, Hengstenberg, Feuerbach, Stier, Harless, Rudelbach, or any other distinguished person? Really, when we consider all the different directions here represented, and remember that intelligence and wisdom increase in proportion to remoteness from the fathers, the whole affair appears so extremely ludicrous, that we must do violence to our muscles, in order to maintain a becoming gravity.

But, granting that the Fathers fell into errors, some into gross errors, and that the early church was sometimes distracted by sad and pernicious heresies, we venture to suppose, that the Socinianism, the Unitarianism, the Universalism, the Rationalism of modern times are not exactly orthodoxy, notwithstanding the immense superiority, in knowledge and discernment, of our times over the first four centuries; and when we consider the gigantic growth, and the Herculean powers, of the modern intellect, we cannot help wondering, that there is not, if not more orthodoxy (for this would really be unreasonable to expect), more originality and ingenuity in the heresies of our day, than we can discover in them. The wonder is, that, if the Fathers were such desperate simpletons, the superlatively acute and immensely learned heretics of modern times should not have succeeded in contriving any thing really new, any thing essentially different from the inventions of the early errorists; nay, that the difference is, as respects acumen, shrewdness and ingenuity, all in favor of the ancients. Unitarianism has its prototype in Arianism: Universalism was invented, in the third century, by Origen: the Rationalists, who criticise where they should meekly learn, who want to know the why and wherefore of every thing, who speculate where they ought to believe, who doubt and quibble and cavil, until they either metamorphose or nullify the entire word of revelation, had their worthy and far superior forerun-

ners in the Gnostics, the reasoners and philosophers, the constructionists and system-builders of the early church. If we had room to spare, this list of parallels might be greatly extended.—But we proceed. If it be true that we, because we live in the nineteenth century, must necessarily be immeasurably in advance of the Fathers, nay, that the meanest capacity in the church of the present day cannot help but have a clearer and better understanding of the word of God than they, we must again call upon those who so strenuously assert and maintain such things, to put their finger upon those doctrines and precepts of the Gospel, which we have so much better comprehended, so much more consistently obeyed. We know very well, that our superiority is asserted in a general way, as embracing, doubtless, the whole compass of religious truth and duty. But we are unreasonable enough not to be satisfied with such broad and sweeping statements: we want specifications: we ask for our distinguished excellencies “a local habitation and a name.” Where then lies our superiority? Do we better understand the language, the Greek of the New Testament? This we humbly venture to doubt, seeing that it was the vernacular of the Greek fathers, and perfectly familiar, from childhood, to the Latin fathers. Do we better understand the great, fundamental, saving truths of the Gospel? This we cannot believe, seeing that even the most strenuous despisers of the Fathers cannot adopt the Augsburg Confession, or any other modern Creed, and vastly prefer the Apostles’ Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the symbolum quicunque, notwithstanding that these were drawn up by those indocile ignoramuses, those pitiful drivellers, the early Fathers. Do we better understand and administer the discipline of the church? We are still full of doubts, and even venture to suggest that the church of the present day might be a great deal better for re-introducing some of the disciplinary principles and practices of the early church. Do we better understand and perform the great duties of our profession? Is our faith more intelligent and vigorous, our hope brighter, and our charity larger and warmer and more self-denyingly active, than were those of the early christians? Go, ye who would presume to assert any such thing, go read the history of the early church, read Coleman’s *Christian Antiquities*, and then hide your diminished heads in shame. Now, if our superiority is not to be found in any of these particulars, where are we to look for it? What does it all mean? We think we can tell, but we shall reserve our explanation until farther on. We have, at present, yet to notice the sweeping assertions which have called forth the pre-

sent article, in their application to the fathers of our own church. It is these whose authority it is, in the present juncture of affairs, more particularly the object of our self-eulogists to censure and depreciate: it is to these that they are more immediately interested to apply that unlimited proposition, that we moderns must, in the necessity and nature of things, be superior to the Fathers: that the meanest capacity in the present church must necessarily have a better understanding of the truths of religion than they could possibly have had. Is this true in fact? As this has been so strongly asserted, and as the onus probandi rests, of course, upon those who make assertions, we are much inclined to do no more than call upon the panegyrist of the moderns, to prove what they say; and we cannot but think, that they would be rather puzzled to bring their demonstration to the Q. E. D. Yet, for obvious reasons, it will not do to dismiss the subject without a few more words. As our opponents have never distinctly informed us, whom we are to regard as the fathers of the Lutheran church, we are left to conjecture; and we suppose that the prominent and influential theologians from Luther down to the authors of the Formula-Concordiæ are meant. Is it true, then, that modern theologians, nay the feeblest minds in the church of our day, know and understand better what the word of God teaches, than Luther, Melancthon, Chemnitz, Brenz, Andreæ, Chyträus, and the other distinguished Lutheran worthies of the sixteenth century? To this question, so far as regards the meanest capacity in the church of the present day, no man of sane mind will expect a serious reply. To modern theologians we shall hereafter concede as much as we conscientiously can; but we totally deny that the great scheme of salvation, the prominent and fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, and the word of God in general, are understood one iota better by modern Biblical scholars, than they were by the leaders of the Reformation. If it were otherwise, the great value which is still, and justly, set upon the writings of those men, could be characterized only as a monstrous instance of human infatuation. If their writings are much less known than those of recent divines, the reason simply is, that they are either written in Latin, or in an antiquated style; but still more, that, the moderns give us duodecimos to read, the fathers of the Lutheran church, who did thoroughly whatever they undertook, published ponderous folios or quartos, which are explored by few who are not intent upon writing books themselves. But it is a noteworthy fact, well known to those who are conversant with both the early and the later Lutheran

literature, that modern theologians, either of exegetical, dogmatical or practical works, are often greatly indebted to the writings of those much condemned fathers, and that they draw largely upon the stores of learning and thought deposited in the bulky tomes of the sixteenth century. They are considered public property in a very peculiar sense, in that it may be plundered without acknowledgment. We recently met a striking instance of this kind, where we least expected it.

But we greatly doubt whether we should ever have heard any thing about the immeasurable superiority in intelligence and theological learning of modern theologians and church-members generally, over Luther and his co-adjutors and immediate successors, were it not, that so many Lutherans in America have virtually forsaken the creed of our church, and, more particularly, denied and utterly renounced certain articles which it contains. To defend, or in any way discuss these, cannot, of course, be our purpose here. And we only remark on this subject, that there is nothing of which we are more certain than this, that many of those who are so violently opposed to our symbolical books, do not understand the articles which they controvert, and have little or no knowledge of the standards of our church. And still further, if the fathers really were, in comparison with us, such rude and ignorant creatures, that they ought to be called the children and we the fathers (as has been generally asserted), it must be regarded as a most astounding phenomenon, that in Germany, that favorite abode of vast and profound learning, many of the deepest and soundest thinkers, of the most illustrious scholars, of the greatest theologians of modern times, of the present day, have been and are rigid adherents of the Symbolical books of the Lutheran church, strictly loyal to the unaltered Augsburg Confession; and that they have devoted, and continue to devote, their best abilities to the defence, and the clearer and fuller unfolding of the doctrines which they set forth as the doctrines of God's word. And we must frankly acknowledge, that between these eminent and excellent men, and those who have so valiantly taken up the cudgels against the unaltered Augsburg Confession, a comparison cannot, in our estimation, be for one moment thought of.

Ere we proceed to other and more general considerations, we shall state but one more objection to the unlimited proposition so confidently advanced respecting the claims and authority of the fathers, and that is, that those who advance it have no faith in it themselves. Of course we do not question their sincerity in uttering the opinions which we are contro-

verting: we number the contradiction, which we discover between their theory and their practice, among the many inconsistencies in which human life abounds. It is by their actions, by their conduct, that men are to be judged; and so judging, we perceive a remarkable discrepancy between men's avowed opinions relative to the subject in hand, and their constant, habitual practice. If not among mankind in general, yet certainly among those who make pretensions to a liberal education, there seems to prevail a sort of superstitious veneration for antiquity, with which we cannot cordially sympathize; and among writers of every description, ancient authorities, the older the better, are in constant and great demand. Authors of books, writers for periodicals, orators who figure at anniversaries and other occasions, even lawyers and legislators, rejoice exceedingly when they can bring forward, in support or illustration of their views, quotations from ancient writers: with these they would give authority and weight to their arguments, point and force to their rhetoric, and commend their opinions to favor and acceptance. And the farther back they can carry us into the dim vista of centuries past, the more confident and exulting are they. So extensive and inveterate is this propensity to refer and defer to the ancients, and to enlighten moderns with the wisdom of hoar antiquity, that it is almost a matter of congratulation, that the works of the Phœnician Sanchoniathon have been lost, and still more so, that the *cacoëthes scribendi* did not prevail in the time of our original progenitor; for, if he had written books, and they had actually come down to us, there is reason to apprehend, that modern books would be made up, in a great degree, of quotations from them.

Modern theologians manifest the same propensity to show, that they know something of the fathers, to appeal to their authority, and to cite their opinions; and we discover among writers in our own church, however much they may glory in the independence of this progressive age, a decided tendency to defer to the authority of the early reformers, and to pile quotations upon quotation from their writings, in support and confirmation of their opinions. From this practice, to which we shall be the last to object, our strenuous opposers of the Fathers are as little free as others. In confirmation of this assertion, we shall, without specifically pointing to the immense amount of evidence abounding on every hand, refer only to the article beginning *Evangelical Review*, Vol. I. No. IV. p. 524. And we would only say, in dismissing this part of our subject, that, until the practice of those who profess to con-

sider the fathers as utterly unworthy of consideration, because of their inappreciable inferiority in sagacity and learning to ourselves, is more consistent with the theory which they so boldly advance, and so zealously uphold, we must be excused from accepting *them* as infallible authorities in the premises.

We think that we have fairly shown, that the propositions, which have latterly been so often and so confidently urged, with a view to depreciate the Fathers, and especially those of our own church, are paradoxical and absurd. But if it be asked, whether we intend utterly to deny that the present century is in any respect in advance of antiquity, or of the period of the Reformation, we must, of course, disclaim every such preposterous design. We readily admit that there has been, and is, a great deal of progress. But we doubt whether much that is claimed to be progress, deserves to be so regarded; and the question arises: in what respects are modern times really in advance of antiquity? A question to which, in some particulars, the answer is easy, in others by no means so quickly found: to be found only by acute and searching investigation, close and discriminating comparison, and profound reflection; and to which we have neither time, nor space, nor ability, to do justice. We shall therefore content ourselves with a few general observations. And we contend, then, that while the immense progress of modern times cannot be denied, it is *mainly* to be predicated of the external affairs and arrangements of domestic and social life, that it is *chiefly* manifested in certain mechanical and operations; in sciences aiming at the discovery of the objects, phenomena, relations and laws of the material universe; in extensive and wonderful conquests over external nature, and in multiplied and successful processes of rendering these discoveries and conquests subservient to the common interests of this earthly life, to our physical comfort and enjoyment, to the advancement and extension of commerce and wealth, to the increase of luxury and effeminacy. However alluring the theme, we must forbear expatiating on the discoveries and achievements of modern astronomy, chemistry and other natural sciences, which are indeed great and wonderful. But, while we are by no means insensible to the impulse which these have given to the human mind, to the vast enlargement of the field of thought and speculation, to the glorious contemplations on the power, wisdom and goodness of the Creator, which they are calculated to call forth, and which they ever will excite in religious and devout souls, we must, as these are considerations that do not really belong here, persist in maintaining, and, not having space for argu-

ment, must be content with asserting, that the evidences of human progress are chiefly and most strikingly discernible in physical results and temporal affairs; in achievements which betoken, indeed, the wonderful ingenuity of men, but which tend rather to diminish than to increase the real and substantial happiness of our race. Mechanical operations and manufacturing processes are vastly multiplied, extended and expedited; time and space are all but annihilated by the power of steam and the mysterious agency of electro-magnetism; all tending to improve and adorn the external life of man, and to promote and render universal a certain kind of civilization or refinement, at the expense, often, of the higher and better interests of mankind. Very much doubting whether even Chemistry and French genius have succeeded in rendering the modern cuisine at all superior to that of Lucullus and other Roman epicures, we find the most obvious proofs of modern progress, in the enormous facilities of locomotion, and in the immense extent and detail of manufacturing operations. It is necessary here to look at the subject without reference to the purifying and elevating influences and effects of christianity, whether directly on its true friends, or indirectly on society at large: leaving, therefore, these out of view for the present, and looking at mankind simply as unaided by, or refusing the aid of, revelation and the powers of that world whence the revelation comes, we venture to assert, that, in the inward life of the soul, in its displays of active vigor, in its habitual aspirations, objects, desires, pursuits and exercises, in its knowledge of itself, of its interests and destination, in all that pertains to man's higher and spiritual being, there has been—there is—no improvement; and that, if any change there be, this appears, from the contrast produced by the beauty and purity of christian life, to be in many things for the worse.

We are not forgetting the printing-press, nor the immense diffusion of knowledge, and the elevation of the masses in intelligence, which it has effected; but this again is a point which does not really concern us here. We are speaking of the learned world (for we suppose that the marvellous superiority of the meanest capacity may now be left out of view); of the alleged superiority of modern over ancient scholars and thinkers, and that too only within a given sphere; so that the enlargement of the *compass* of knowledge does not properly enter into consideration: we speak of quality, not of quantity; of depth and height, not of breadth or extension; and we have already denied that the modern mind is really more

active, more powerful, more sagacious, more piercing or more soaring than the ancient.

There is, however, one subject, with regard to which there has been, and still is, great progress: we mean the reference which is had, the respect which is shown, in literature, and in the arrangement and management of all the great concerns of human kind, to man as man, to the interests of the people, to those of every member of the great brotherhood. The day is gone by, when, in social organizations, in legal codes, in the administration of government, the claims and interests of the few who wore crowns, or held patents of nobility, or constituted privileged classes and castes, were first and perhaps solely considered, protected, provided for and secured, while the masses were looked upon as creatures essentially inferior, as drudges fit only to toil and sweat for their masters, and bound to be thankful that they were permitted to live at all, and to eat their coarse food by special favor of their lordly superiors. In this respect a mighty change has come over the world's aspect; and the human being as such, is asserting his claims, and vindicating and securing his just rights. The civilized world is moving on rapidly to universal democracy. However much there may be in this change, that calls for grateful acknowledgment and heartfelt rejoicing, it is by no means all good, nor altogether tending to happy results. The opinions, principles and tendencies now at work, and spreading, and more and more developing themselves on the European continent, are well adapted to excite serious apprehensions, and the scenes which have been, and still are, witnessed there, are but dim shadows cast before by coming events — premonitory symptoms of anarchy, disorganization, and atheistic experiments. Can any who reflect be blind to the extreme tendencies that are more and more distinctly and violently exhibited in our own land? Let us not forget that extremes meet; and that, when one extreme is reached, it requires but one desperate plunge (and how often has this been made) to reach at once the very climax of the other. And let us not forget either, that the democratic experiment is not new, but old: that it was tried among the classic nations of antiquity, and that among them it failed, because it wanted a real and healthy substratum — that one and only foundation on which a democracy can long prosper, or even exist; that is, a true religion and a sound morality. And while, therefore, we admit that, as respects the concerns and interests of man as such, of each individual as a representative of a race, not a class, — of universal man, there is, at present, much progress of some

kind, we most decidedly contend, that all that is right and good in this movement, right and good in any of the affairs of society, is due to christianity alone; — to its direct operation; and to its indirect influence upon those who scorn its blessings and its hopes. And if the present developments of society are to result in real and permanent good, they must be baptized, vastly more than they now are, with the spirit of our holy religion.

And here we turn away from these general considerations to that part of our subject which demands our special attention, the Fathers of the church, and of ours in particular. It can scarcely be made out to be our duty to state, what it is that we claim for them, in what sense and respect we would reverence and honor them, to what extent we would receive their opinions, and submit to their authority; for our proper business has been to show how absurd and preposterous is the position which has, of late, been so decidedly taken with regard to them. Yet we intend, ere we close, to express, somewhat more fully, our positive opinion of their merits and claims, and we may introduce what remains to be said, with our promised attempt to account for this modern crusade against the venerable Fathers of the church. There are two causes to which it may be ascribed.

I. The spirit of independence, of self-sufficiency and of innovation, which so strongly characterizes the present age, in all its views and measures relative to every interest and institution of social and civil life, has for a long time betrayed its presence and activity in the church also, by an increasing disrespect and contempt for whatever is ancient and long established; by a restless itching for, and pursuit of, novelties; by rationalistic speculations about the doctrines and practices of the church; by audacious criticism of the Sacred Word; by lax notions respecting the sacraments, and the marriage relations; by a philosophical tone of preaching, and by the reckless formation of parties or sects, for reasons of little or no account. The age is ever boasting of its progress. This progress, however, consists in a great measure in a growing license of thought and action; in giving human nature, no matter how perverted and corrupt, its own way, even in childhood; in cutting loose from the recollections, the associations, the relations of history; from the opinions, principles, institutions and usages of the past; in starting new theories and trying new schemes: in short, the age has virtually declared its independence of the past, and to "Young America," "Young England," "Young Germany," "Young France," and other

young existences, the present is important only as the teeming womb of the future. Our limited space forbids our expatiating on this most important subject. We cannot but regard the spirit that rejects the experience and wisdom, that repudiates at pleasure, and for the behoof of modern inventions, the doctrines, institutions, practices and establishments of our forefathers, that eschews all real, vital historic connexion with the past, and sets up, in self-sufficient independence, for itself, as one of extreme and irreverent infatuation. There is not a little of this spirit manifested in the church. But whether exhibited in social, civil, political or ecclesiastical relations and affairs, men will discover by and bye, after abrogating and destroying until nothing old is left, that they have acted like persons who, having ascended some great height, have then thrown down the ladder which helped them to their elevation; and they may find it necessary hereafter, in order to regain their footing on terra firma, to take a tremendous leap, which will rack their every bone and muscle,—their entire organism to its centre.

II. It is a common occurrence in courts of justice that lawyers, when a witness comes forward with evidence that bears with fatal effect upon their client's case, endeavor to discredit the witness, by picking flaws in his character, by representing him either as incompetent, or unworthy of belief. The same thing has often been observed in the church. We know of one distinguished theologian, who occupied, for a long time, a very conspicuous station in the American religious world, and who, when it suited his purpose, stoutly maintained the genuineness of certain reputed epistles of Ignatius, and, when some other object was to be attained, utterly rejected them as spurious. We doubt whether we should ever have heard much about the comparative ignorance and the puerile incompetency of the early fathers, if they did not bear decisive evidence to sundry points of doctrine and practice, which are distasteful to the present hyper-enlightened age. Still less do we believe, that we should ever have heard, within our own church, one word about our immense superiority over the leaders of the Reformation, or have ever been seriously told, that we are, in fact, the fathers, and they the children, and that the meanest capacity of the present church has a clearer insight into the doctrines of the Gospel than they could have had, were it not for a few articles of the Augsburg Confession, which were firmly believed and most vigorously and ably defended, by the Fathers of the Lutheran church, but which are renounced and utterly repudiated by the friends and adhe-

rents of "American Lutheranism," as "exploded dogmas," finding no "favor among the free-thinking, practical, common-sense people of the United States." If we were only willing to immolate on the altar of American Lutheranism, built, not very long ago, with untempered mortar, those very articles in which some of the most prominent characteristic features of genuine Lutheranism are portrayed; if we would only consent to abandon our Confession to the tender mercies of "the free-thinking, practical, common-sense people of the United States," to be mangled and expurgated at their option and discretion, there would doubtless at once be an end of all declamation about the ignorance and childishness of our venerable fathers, in comparison with our maturity and immensely superior intelligence. This point will be briefly resumed ere we conclude. For, although it is high time to bring this article to a close, we have yet, according to promise, a few things to say, respecting both the early fathers, and the fathers of the Lutheran church, as also on the subject in general. We again distinctly deny, that we claim for the early fathers, or those of the sixteenth century, any absolute supremacy in the church, any absolute authority to determine what shall, and what shall not be, the doctrines and practices of the church; but neither do we claim the right for ourselves, wantonly, or without the most cogent reasons, to dissolve, at any point, our historic, our confessional connexion with them. We regard them as fallible men, who were liable to err, and who did err, some more and some less. Hence we do not receive their confessions, their opinions, their expositions, their practices, without judging of their soundness, truthfulness and fitness, by bringing them to the test of God's word, whose authority we, of course, regard as paramount: but, having so tested and proved them, and not found them wanting, we mean to adhere and cling to them, through good and through evil report, "*und wenn die Welt voll Teufel wär!*"

We do not believe doctrines, or adopt practices, *merely because* they are old, and have been handed down from hoar antiquity; for we know full well, that there are old errors and old abuses, as well as new. But we regard the position, in our day so often taken, that we must necessarily be immeasurably in advance of the fathers in the understanding and interpretation of the Scriptures, merely because we live from fourteen to eighteen centuries later than they, as superlative and unadulterated nonsense. The apostolic fathers, were instructed by the apostles themselves, and they read the writings of the Evangelists and Apostles, and heard their oral

instructions, in their own vernacular tongue ; and they again taught those who afterward took their places, in that same language, which was then the medium of learned and literary intercourse throughout the greater part of the Roman empire ; and if we, to whom this language has long been among the dead, and who depend upon the aids furnished by generations of laborious critics, really understand the sacred writings so much better than they could, with all the advantages of viva voce teaching and explanation from those whose knowledge is not open to question, they must indeed have been unparalleled paragons of incorrigible indocility, and doltish stupidity. In our humble estimation the early history of the church exhibits them in a far different light from that in which many moderns are so fond of viewing them. We have freely admitted their liability to err. And, while we find but little to condemn among the apostolic fathers, we frankly concede, that those who came after them did fall into divers, and sometimes grievous, errors ; that they gradually introduced needless, sometimes mischievous practices ; that they gave strange, imaginative, and sometime very absurd expositions of the Sacred Word, and that they propounded sundry fantastic and erroneous opinions ; but, we defy any man, we care not how well read he may be, to point out among the opinions, the speculations, and the exegetical expositions, published by the ancient fathers, any thing more outrageously absurd, more contemptibly silly, than the specimens, which can be pointed out, in rank, rich, luxurious abundance, in the works of our modern, excessively learned and accomplished rationalists.

The admissions that we have made are true of individual fathers, in their private capacity, but only in a very small degree of the early church, acting in her collective authority, in ecumenical councils. But all this we are not to ascribe to their stupidity and ignorance (which, if we moderns really are immeasurably superior to them, must have been monstrous indeed), but to the extraordinary circumstances and influences of their times. Let it be remembered that, in their day, Christianity, that pure and holy child of heaven, had but recently entered our world ; a world divided between Judaism, and every species and modification of paganism, and wicked and corrupt beyond the power of rhetoric to describe ; that Judaism had sunk into degeneracy and obstinate and fanatical addictedness to human inventions ; and that the pagan world was the theatre of childish superstition, aside of lax indifference and contempt of all religion, of philosophical speculation and skepticism, of many and conflicting philosophical

systems, of gloomy or wildly fanciful oriental theories, and withal boundless licentiousness, and that all these existing and prevailing and deeply-rooted elements were the bitter enemies of christianity: let it be remembered that from among these the christian church had to obtain, — to wrest by force of reasoning and persuasion, her materials, and that of her newly converted members, few, if any, were likely to get rid, immediately, of all their long cherished errors; and that opinions of every sort and shade were brought, greatly modified no doubt, but not eradicated, into the church: let it be borne in mind that all these conflicting elements, agreeing among each other only in their hostility to christianity, were roaring, and beating, and surging, like tempest-tossed billows, against the church from without; and, as it was impossible to exclude entirely their influence from their pale, producing fermentation, excitement, collisions within; opening the door to the inroads of error, and preparing the way for heresy. At this present time we can form no conception of the immense agitation, and the convulsive efforts, produced in the minds of men by the introduction of christianity, that heavenborn regenerative, fructifying, renovating principle and power of a new life, which was to revolutionize the world. "I came not to send peace, but a sword." (See Matth. 10: 34. sqq.) Our readers are familiar with the early history of the church, and we must be brief. We only ask: is it to be wondered at that errors and wild notions crept into, and were brought to light in, the church? Would it not be a wonder if the result had been otherwise? Considering that the early christians — the early fathers — were but fallible men, is it not a wonder that amid, and under so many distracting and corrupting influences, she maintained, to the extent that she did, her purity and integrity? And are the Fathers to be tried and condemned upon other principles than the men of our day? If the ecclesiastical dignitaries, writers and developments of our day, were judged and sentenced in the same summary and sweeping fashion, in which those of early days are dealt with, what would become of them? Are there no errors, no heresies, no abuses and corruptions in our day? We confess that in the many conflicting theories, and isms and heresies of our day, that in the bigoted and fanatical adherence of certain sects to certain doctrinal views, and non-essential institutions or usages, in the credulity and gullibility exhibited by the numerous followers of divers fanatics and impostors, and in the multiplied distinctions in doctrine and practice, each claiming to be *the* truth, and *the* right way, we can discover no evidence of the mon-

strous superiority of the present age over that of the early fathers; and when we ask: *where* is it? Echo answers *where?*

While, therefore, we claim neither supremacy, nor infallibility for the church-fathers of the first four centuries, we shall, in spite of ridicule and contemptuous sneers, cling to them with tenacious grasp, as to the most important section in that great historic chain that connects us with the apostolic age, and binds us to the corner-stone of the temple of our faith: we shall ever remember them with gratitude, and speak of them with reverence, as the first heirs of that glorious inheritance, which, bequeathed by the Eternal Word, and dispensed by apostolic hands, they so conscientiously and zealously administered, so vigilantly guarded, and so faithfully transmitted to coming generations. However much some, or many, of them, may have erred in their individual opinions and efforts, they were, in the main, men of splendid abilities, of pure intentions, of fervent piety, of lofty integrity, and of holy zeal; and in their collective capacity, as the oft-assembled fathers and guardians of the infant church, they conferred upon posterity incalculable benefits, by watching over the purity and for the preservation of the genuine apostolic writings,—by recording the history, chronicling the experiences, the struggles, trials, conflicts and triumphs of the early church,—by settling and defining, amidst clashing opinions, amidst the strife and contentions of parties and sectaries, amidst the assaults, the stratagems, the calumnies and revilings of the originators or adherents of truculent or plausible heresies, the true orthodox faith of the church universal, in venerable symbols which have stood the test and the shocks of ages, and still stand, profoundly venerated as noble monuments of their clear-sighted sagacity, their comprehensive understanding, their staunch and unflinching honesty, and their simple, humble, mighty, scriptural faith. They are to us the intelligent and upright interpreters of that wonderful age, in which christianity, represented at first by a little handful of obscure men, gradually fought its way, with the peaceful weapons of truth and righteousness, to the shop of the artizan, to the study of the philosopher, to the halls of the noble, to the turreted battlements of the chieftain, to the throne of the Caesars, to the empire of the world; and we could better spare any portion, or the whole, of the church's history previous to the Reformation, than theirs. We acknowledge, once again, their errors and defects: we cannot bow to their authority in matters of faith and practice, no more than to that of any other man or set of men, without a candid appeal

to the word of inspiration ; but there is a *vast* amount of matter, of incalculable moment to the church, with respect to which we do and must appeal to them as to our only informants, as to honest, sincere, right-meaning men : we hold them in profound respect as the frank and dignified historians of the church,—as the able expounders of her faith,—as the learned expositors of the Scriptures,—as the earnest, the eloquent, the mightily convincing and persuading preachers of the word,—as the strenuous advocates of the unity of the church,—as the fearless defenders and apologists of our holy religion ; who encountered the subtle philosopher and foiled him, the bitter and malignant Jew and converted him, the corrupt and vicious heathen, and turned him from his idols and abominations, to the love of the Savior and the life of holiness ; who carried the message of salvation to the ends of the earth, and laid down their lives for their faith among wild beasts, in loathsome dungeons and at the stake. And when we look at the self-complacent spirit of this self-lauding age,—at its rationalistic subtleties of speculation, at its sectarian distractions, and its many other pitiful developments, we say : honor to the great, the noble, the glorious old fathers !

And now, a word more about our superiority to the Fathers of our church. We shall, of course, say nothing more about the ridiculous assertion, that, in respect of religious truth, the meanest capacity in the church of our day must necessarily be more intelligent than the heroes of the Reformation : we are almost ashamed that we have noticed it at all. But as respects the learned world, the theologians of the present day, the expounders and commentators of the Sacred Scriptures, the opinions which are here controverted are entitled to more attention ; not because we consider them correct, but because there is some truth mixed up with a large amount of mere semblance of plausibility. We begin then with frankly admitting, that in philological criticism generally, and of course in Biblical criticism under any of its appropriate aspects, there has been great progress made since the days of the Reformation, and still continues to be made. This fact is so notorious that it needs no proof. But even here, with what sad qualifications must our admission be burdened. It is, of course, in Germany, that the science of criticism and its application to ancient writings, and those of the Scriptures in particular, has been brought to its greatest perfection : so much so that the critical labors of other countries deserve, with some honorable exceptions, but little consideration. But what have been its

results? Wherever it threw off its allegiance to the orthodox faith of the church, its respect for the direct, simple, obvious meaning of the language of Scripture, what arbitrary and impertinent principles has it not developed, and with what reckless and audacious effrontery have they not been applied to the Sacred text of both the Old and the New Testament, so that, (not to go into any farther specifications), the Book of Isaiah is a piece of patchwork — and the work of a pseudo-Jesaias, containing nothing about Christ, nor any real prophecies at all; and the Gospel of St. John was never written by St. John, but is a spurious production of later times! — Have not living orthodox Lutheran theologians of Germany, characterized the modern criticism of the gospels as “criticism run mad?” Those who are not acquainted with the wild antics, the desperate processes, and the shocking results of what in Germany is termed the “Higher Criticism,” will find ample information respecting it, and rich illustrations of it, in the Introductory treatises given by Dr. J. A. Alexander, in the volumes of his admirable Commentary on Isaiah. We cannot better describe this modern system (the marvellous superiority of which does not seem to meet with much recognition or appreciation among the eulogists of the powers and efforts of the modern mind), than in the following words of Rev. Dr. Schmucker: “In Germany, where infidelity has assumed its most learned type, neologians have frittered away the sense of every passage that opposed their views, by the unhallowed theory of accommodation and other false principles of exegesis; and, following the guidance of their higher criticism, falsely so called, have rejected one book after another from the sacred canon, until they have divested of all claim to inspiration, the whole, or nearly the whole of those Scriptures, which Paul affirms were given by inspiration of God.” (Evang. Rev. No. VI. p. 151. sq.) The Doctor says on a subsequent page, [p. 171.] “At last, after passing through various fluctuations in the neological schools of Germany, this science has settled down on the principles of common sense, designated the *historical interpretation*, which will not, we think, soon be again shaken. It is now admitted, that in making a revelation to men, in order that it might be intelligible, God must necessarily use language in the sense in which it was understood by those to whom it was addressed; and that the Scriptures must therefore be interpreted on the same principles, which are applied to uninspired human compositions.” This is unquestionably true of the truly evangelical theologians of Germany, the greater part of whom are staunch adherents of the Augs-

burg Confession. But we would ask whether this adoption of the principle of "historical interpretation," is not merely a return to the simple, common-sense, reverent and devout method of commenting on the Scriptures, pursued, as far as their facilities permitted, by the fathers of the Lutheran church? We do, indeed, readily admit, that great progress has been made in the science of criticism, because the knowledge required, the resources demanded, by the critic, have, by the studies and researches of successive generations, been greatly augmented and multiplied; and because increased skill has been the result of long experience and much practice. But we totally deny that this progress and these results have had any effect upon the amount or clearness of the knowledge possessed by the theologians, of the great body of religious truth — of the great fundamental truths of the Gospel. The results have been important, principally in respect of minute particulars; in settling many vexed questions of secondary, or subordinate importance; in removing doubts; in determining disputed points; in clearing up obscure passages, — often in throwing light upon what was already clear. But we deny that they have added aught to the great body of what the evangelical church has ever held as the truth of Scripture; and we positively assert, that the general tenor and meaning of the Scriptures, the saving truths of the Gospel, the fundamental doctrines and the nature of the holy sacraments of our divine religion, were as accurately, as clearly, as fully and as thoroughly understood by the fathers of the Lutheran church, as by any theologian of modern times. And those who assert, that we understand all these things vastly better than they did, are herewith challenged to prove their assertion true, and to point out the doctrines which are so much better understood by us; and if they point us to certain articles of the Augsburg Confession, so offensive to the friends of "American Lutheranism," we are not alarmed: we know that great numbers of our American clergy have revised their modern opinions, and have returned, or are returning, to the broad doctrinal platform derived by our fathers directly from the Scriptures, so that we have on our side a host of the most profoundly learned theologians of modern times, firmly devoted to the Augsburg Confession.

We are deeply convinced, that the tendency to dissolve all vital, and practically fruitful historical connexion with the past (in which all modern life has its root), and to disregard, wherever it is convenient, the *disparities* of the church from the earliest ages, which is so often and so extensively exhibited in

our day, involves many most serious and momentous considerations, and is attended with a variety of disastrous consequences, of which some have already come to maturity, whereas of others we see only the beginnings. But upon all these we cannot here expatiate. We ascribe these manifestations to that spirit of independence, of self-complacent free-thinking, and self-sufficient freedom to choose, to reject, to say and to do, whatsoever seems agreeable or expedient, which characterizes our age, and which proceeds, without scruple or hesitation, from one innovation to another. Of this we have a sufficient illustration in our own church. First, the standards of the Lutheran church are virtually, practically abandoned; next, explanations are given, and theories set up, to justify this abandonment: then, in order to justify the whole proceeding, a new sort of Lutheranism is invented, under the title of "*American Lutheranism*;" ample liberty in all things being implied in the adjective "*American*;" and now, with what specific object in view we know not, another new title is promulgated, to wit: "*Our American Lutheran church of the General Synod.*" Thus is the law of progress kept in operation. But against all this, we have this one serious objection to urge, that Lutheranism is neither a chameleon, nor a figure of gutta-percha, nor a weather-cock. Lutheranism is a fixed fact, a downright positive something, an actual, veritable, distinctly defined entity, portrayed and defined in its own symbol; and it is purely impossible for us to conceive how a church rejecting Lutheranism can be Lutheran. We have indeed been recently informed by one, whose authority on all subjects connected with *American Lutheranism* is paramount, that "we pay due respect to our ecclesiastical ancestry, and secure sufficient doctrinal uniformity, when we declare our belief, that the Augsburg Confession, the mother-symbol of Protestantism, presents a substantially accurate exhibition of the fundamental articles of God's Word." This declaration could be readily, and ex animo subscribed by christians of any denomination, and has therefore nothing at all to do with the distinctive characteristics of the Lutheran church, especially as we are, at the same time, distinctly notified, of "the abandonment of the doctrine of the real or bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist, by the vast majority of the Lutheran church both in Europe [?] and America?" We might as well say: "We pay due respect to the great Mediator and his Apostles, and secure sufficient doctrinal uniformity, when we declare our belief that the New Testament presents a substantially accurate and complete exhibition of saving truth,

only we must be allowed to disbelieve and reject the doctrine of Christ's Divinity, and of the Atonement, and any other doctrine which, although taught by the New Testament, does not correspond with *our* systems. We know, indeed, that the New Testament is God's Word, while the Augsburg Confession is a human digest and expose of christian doctrine. But this momentous difference does not make the inconsistency one iota less in the one case than in the other: and moreover, Unitarians, Universalists, and other heretics show, that it is quite the fashion to talk and act in this way in the present superlatively enlightened age. We would not imitate their example: we would scrupulously eschew all such proceedings. And as we are by no means prepared to accept the proposition, that modern theologians understand the great and glorious doctrines of the Gospel vastly better than our ecclesiastical ancestors, we are content to believe as they did, and to stand upon that broad and noble platform, constructed from and with the truths of God's Holy Word, by the learned, the wise, the devout and devoted heroes of the Reformation, the illustrious fathers of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

ARTICLE III.

THE SILENT INFLUENCE OF THE BIBLE.*

By Rev. J. Few Smith, A. M., Professor in the Theological Seminary,
Auburn, N. York.

In addressing such an audience as I see before me, it can scarcely be necessary to adduce arguments to prove that it is our duty to distribute freely the Holy Scriptures. That point, surely, will be readily admitted by all. Neither am I called to pronounce a panegyric on the Bible. The Bible needs no eulogy. Like the starry heavens that shine down upon us at night, while exhibiting their own attractive splendors speaking silently forth the glory of their Maker, the Bible is all glorious in itself, and glorious in the story of its origin. Bearing the impress of the Deity, it is radiant with his effulgence. The Word of God, it needeth not the praise of human lips.

* This article was originally delivered as an address before the Bible Society of Pennsylvania College and Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, in 1849, and is now published by request, and without alteration.

Yet while neither argument nor panegyric may be necessary, we may, by seizing upon some important principles deeply seated in human nature, and some grand features of the Holy Volume, and some illustrative facts in its history, and contemplating these for a little time, find our convictions of duty deepened, and perhaps feel our hearts leaping forth with zeal for an energetic, and diligent doing of that which we ought to do.

It was a noble declaration of a noble mind: "I can scarce think any pains misspent that bring me in solid evidences of that great truth, that the Scripture is the word of God, which is, indeed, the Grand Fundamental. And I use the Scripture not as an arsenal, to be resorted to only for arms and weapons to defend this, or that party, or to defeat its enemies; but as a matchless Temple, where I delight to be, to contemplate the beauty, the symmetry, and the magnificence of the structure, and to increase my awe, and excite my devotion to the Deity, there preached and adored."¹ Such a declaration is as replete with wisdom as with noble sentiment. The word of God is indeed "an arsenal" in which the friends of Truth may be furnished with armor for the combat with the legions of Error and Falsehood. But more beautifully is it to be regarded as "a matchless Temple": — a fitting place for meditation, and for worship—admirable, indeed, for its "beauty and symmetry and magnificence of structure" — but most to be visited because therein a sweetly subduing influence settles on the turbulent spirit, and the fires of unholy passion become extinguished, and the anxious questionings of the soul are answered, and it is lifted up in devotion to the Great and Benevolent God. Not as a code of laws, not as a history of past transactions, not as a record of wonders, not as the utterance of the awful voice of Jehovah, not simply as an authorized announcement of the way of life, is the Bible most precious regarded; but as the token of Divine Love, as the expression of the heart of the Great God, as the winning message of a loving Friend, as an influence drawing the soul to that Friend, leading it in the way of life, and filling it with sublime and loving aspirations after holiness and devotion to Jehovah. There is a *Silent Influence* proceeding from the Holy Book, powerful and productive of various and vast results; an influence felt by all who read it, and extending itself through them to others who never look upon its opened pages: an influence which gives

¹ The Hon. Robert Boyle — quoted in Anderson's Annals of the English Bible.

light to man, which gives understanding to the simple, which even now is transforming the character of nations, and giving a new face to the world. To some remarks on this subject, *The Silent Influence of the Bible*, I wish now to invite your attention. This influence presents itself to our view under three aspects: The *Intellectual*, the *Moral*, and the *Religious*. Each of these shall receive some notice, while the last will claim our more particular attention.

It is one of the most striking, and most valuable characteristics of the Bible, that it is *the Book of mankind*. It is both designed, and prepared, for all people, and for all classes of people. In it God addresses the whole human family: and as a parent speaking to his household seeks to adapt himself to the comprehension of each member of the circle, so is the word of God made to suit itself to the wants and the conditions of all. This is preëminently true with regard to its religious instruction: but it is also true in a general sense. The most intelligent mind, and the most cultivated taste may find in the Bible sources of information, means of mental discipline, of intellectual improvement, and of literary cultivation. The scholar may be delighted with its strains of poetry, its beautiful imagery, its terseness of expression, its richness of thought, its glorious themes of contemplation. The student of human nature may derive instruction from its historic records, its simple narratives, its faithful delineations, its searching revelations of the working of the heart. The inquirer into the history of our race, may be furnished with most ancient records, and even though he may not fully acknowledge its divine original, may at least derive light from it: bowing to it, however, as God's own word, he is led to fountains of historic truth such as are nowhere else to be found. The civilian has herein unfolded for his study a code of laws and a system of government of high antiquity, and of peculiar interest; while he also has much light thrown upon the state of jurisprudence and general civilization among various ancient nations, whose influence the world still feels. While for all these classes, in the perusal of the Sacred Volume, there is exerted an influence tending to the expansion of the mind, and to the cultivation of purity and strength, and proper elevation of literary taste. No man, indeed, whatever be his religious sentiments, has fulfilled the duty of a scholar, who has not read the Bible either in the original, or in his own tongue: and no man can read it carefully without finding in it a source of intellectual improvement—without feeling its influence silently exerted in his mind. Ample testimony is borne to this fact by

men of every department of cultivated mind, and of every variety of opinions. The Bible is a book for the scholar. He cannot be without it — not only because its language and its sentiments are now interwoven into the very frame-work of all civilized society, but also because of the important and excellent influence which it may exert on his own intellectual character. And I would commend to all who, in connection with the literary Institutions of this place, are aiming at literary proficiency, these words of Sir Thomas Browne: "I do believe the Holy Scriptures to be the word of God; yet were it of man, I could not choose but say it was the singularlest, and superlative piece that hath been extant since the creation; were I a pagan I should not refrain the lecture of it, and cannot but commend the judgment of Ptolmey that thought not his library complete without it." *Religio Medici*, p. 55.

And to this let me add the language of one of the greatest of men of our own day, an honor to our country, the venerable Adams: "I speak as a man of the world to men of the world—and I say to you, Search the Scriptures. It is a book which neither the most ignorant and weakest, nor the most learned, and intelligent mind, can read without improvement." Nor can I forbear reciting the oft quoted words of the distinguished scholar and jurist, Sir William Jones: "I have carefully and regularly perused the Holy Scriptures, and am of opinion that the Volume, independent of its divine origin, contains more sublimity, purer morality, more important history and finer strains of eloquence, than can be collected from all other books in whatever language they may have been written."

But it is in view of the millions of our race whose education is comparatively neglected that this intellectual influence of the Bible is most valuable. It should be remembered, however, in this connection, that every cultivated intellect exerts an influence upon the uncultivated mass; so that what tends to the cultivation of one affects the whole. Facts clearly show that a Bible-reasoning community is more intelligent, that it carries a more elevated tone of thought and judgment, more correctness of taste and perception, is, on the whole, in a higher intellectual condition, than a community in which the Bible is unknown or neglected. The *preaching* of divine truth, the services of the sanctuary which usually accompany a free distribution of the Sacred Scriptures, do their part for the production of this effect. But independantly of these, and of the education of the Sabbath School, which itself is due to the Bible, the silent influence of the Bible in cultivating the taste,

and elevating the thoughts, and enlarging the comprehensions of the masses of men, is undoubtedly very great. The Bible is a grand Teacher of the community. It is the Schoolmaster in the family. It is a most potent friend and promoter of the great cause of Popular Education. None can be its reader, or frequently hear it read, without intellectual profiting. And while this will in all probability be found true of all communities in which the Bible is read, in whatever language, it is peculiarly true of the English Bible. No book, probably, does more to give correctness and beauty of expression to the language of the millions who speak that tongue. Abounding in apothegms in pointed maxims, in beautiful and apt illustrations, with a sweet simplicity throwing its charming character over the whole, and yet with a strength and forcefulness unsurpassed, it is well adapted to form the general style; while its wondrous and lofty themes serve to interest and expand the general mind. The story of Scotland, and of Puritan England and America, amply establishes this point: while the records of German Literature and German History will tell us how much the Bible given to the people by the great Reformer, in their own nervous and rich language, accomplished at once for the general improvement, and how it even now exerts its formative and salutary influence.

But the *Moral Influence* of the Bible is of still higher significance. I need not stop to speak of the morality, which the Bible teaches, as the purest, and best adapted in the promotion of human good, that the world has ever seen. What else should we expect from Him who is infinite in purity and wisdom? How should the streams flowing from such a fountain be otherwise than bright and healthful, and pleasant to the soul? And what shall we look for from a people by whom this Bible is read, and who are brought under its influence? May we not expect to see them improved in all that pertains to individual and social welfare? and do not facts sustain this expectation?

The Bible is the friend of virtue, of good order, of domestic happiness, of liberty, and in favor of all these it is continually exerting its influence. Wherever it has gone it has proved itself the Reformer of the Morals, and a blessing to men. It rebukes all evil. It opposes a restraint to passion. It sternly reproves selfishness. It inculcates benevolence and brotherly kindness. It is an enemy to vice, and to all that disturbs the peace of society, or the happiness of mankind. And its history clearly shows, that it has ever exerted a most benign in-

fluence on the communities in which it has been found. Often times, unaccompanied by any aid, dispersed among the people, like leaven hid in the meal, it has quietly wrought great changes, not only in individuals or in families, but in whole neighborhoods. It has ever been a light in the dwelling, and a glory and blessing to the nation, and to it the cause of human liberty, and human good is incalculably indebted. The truth of this will be most strikingly exhibited by a glance at some facts. We need not resort for our illustrations to contrasts between Heathen and Christian lands: nor need we go back to the ages preceding the Reformation, during which the Bible was to the millions of the people a sealed book, and even to the large majority of those who presumed to be professed teachers of its doctrines was unknown. After the Reformation the Southern nations of Europe, for the most part, resisted the introduction of the Sacred Scriptures among the people, while in the North their circulation was favored.— Even at the present day the grand distinction between Protestant and Catholic nations lies in the fact, that the one excludes the Bible, while the other gives it to the people: or rather one gives the word of God mingled and defiled with human traditions, the other, in its purity. Now it is found that in the Bible reading nations there is and ever has been, more liberty, more elevation of the people, more general comfort and happiness, and more general intelligence, as well as a higher regard to the laws of equity, of benevolence, of social kindness, than in those nations which are ignorant of God's Word. The Bible has served, and is serving, to break down the tyranny of the Monarch, of Feudalism, and of Priestcraft. It elevates the people. It enforces the great principle which lies at the foundation of sound government, *the Equality of Rights*, and teaches that government is intended for the general good of the nation, and not for the aggrandizement of the few. It makes the people feel their strength, and leads them to assert their rights. While at the same time it promotes good order, makes a nation law-loving and obedient, and opposes itself to wars. To sustain these remarks you may contrast Germany with Spain and Italy, or even Protestant with Catholic Germany—or Scotland with Ireland. Spain has obstinately refused to allow the Bible to come among the people—and what a scene does she present? Scarce a nation on the earth so low in consideration, and so slight in influence as she—torn with internal distraction, in almost constant anarchy, with an impoverished people, and a tarnished name abroad. Scotland, rich in the Bible, has long been noted for the morality and intelligence of

her people: while poor Ireland, with all her native resources, and all the inherent excellence of her people, enshrouded in ignorance and cursed with oppression, has been the prey of designing men; has exhibited the fierceness of savages; even now writhes in wretchedness and is stained with most revolting crimes. Of Italy the lament might long have been, "How has the mighty fallen! How art thou destroyed, O thou renowned city!" A new life seems now to be stirring her cold form. The principle of popular rights seems to have forced itself an acknowledgment. Strange scenes have been enacted within the ancient city, and strange voices heard — scenes which might stir the blood of a Brutus or a Rienzi, and make a Borgia or a Gregory tremble — and although we may not fully understand the much lauded Pius, we trust that in this movement will be found the germs of Italian liberty, and noble elevation. But it is worthy of careful observation, that within the past few years there have been circulated in Italy a number of copies of the Holy Bible as received by Protestants: and while we may not be able to trace directly to these any of the new popular opinion, and recognition of popular rights, yet I doubt not they have been silently exerting their influence; and to these Bibles and to others that shall follow them must the lover of human liberty and human improvement, look, with hopeful eye, for the regeneration of Italy. If we look to Great Britain and America, we shall find the history of the silent moral influence of the Bible deeply interesting. The first English translation of the Sacred Scriptures, that of Wickliffe, remaining in manuscript, could not be extensively read because the copies of it were comparatively few. Yet that had its important and excellent influence. — Voices were lifted up in its behalf even in high places. It cast into the British soil a germ of life which has never perished. And I do not hesitate to express the opinion, that to the English Bible are Great Britain and America very greatly, if not mainly, indebted for their large liberty, and grand national characteristics. But for a long time the influence was silently working in England. The translation by Tyndale was among the first printed English books: but all the authority of the crown and the hierarchy opposed its introduction among the people. Yet it went among them, despite of persecution and of martyrdom, and it was silently working in many homes and many hearts. It was concealed from the search of those in authority, and thus numerous copies were handed down from father to son.

"Fierce, whisker'd guards that Volume sought in vain,
 Enjoyed by stealth, and hid with anxious pain ;
 While all around was misery and gloom,
 This showed the boundless bliss beyond the tomb ;
 Freed from the venal priest, the feudal rod,
 It led the sufferer's weary steps to God ;
 And when his painful course on earth was run,
 This, his chief wealth, descended to his son."

"The highly prized treasure, read often in the dead of the night, was concealed under the bed, in hay-lofts, or in out-houses;" and in one case—"a diligent search being made for all suspicious books"—"a gentleman sent for a bricklayer, and built up a wall in his chamber against the place where all his books were, and so inclosed them in security from the danger of being taken, preserving them for himself against better times."¹ And so by means of its silent influence, the people were made to be in advance of their rulers; and when the latter openly threw off the Romish yoke, they found a nation ready to rejoice in freedom. And as the light of Divine Truth was more widely diffused, and clearly perceived, the principles of civil liberty were more fully realized, and Britain advanced then forward to her present high degree of glorious freedom. The influence of the Bible was seen in her noble-hearted Puritans, and converted a rebellion into a revolution pregnant with most happy issues. It was seen in the colonists who came to these western regions, and sought and found "freedom to worship God." It is seen in our free Institutions—in the foundation and the pillars of this great Republic. It is seen in the general intelligence and love of order of our people. It is clearly to be discerned in the footsteps of our Puritan and subsequent ancestry, and in our revolutionary struggle. And it makes the striking contrast between our happy Republic, and the neighboring States of Mexico, and South America. Here are brought into close contact a nation with the Bible, and a nation without it, and the most careless and most prejudiced observer cannot fail to be struck with the vast difference between the two.

An equally remarkable and striking illustration of the moral influence of the Bible is furnished us in the contrast between the French Revolution of 1793, and the English and American Revolutions; and also by the admirable resistance in Britain and America to the demoralizing influences of the French commotion. France was a wild scene of passion, of fierce rioting, of blood and carnage. *She had no Bible among her*

¹ Annals of the English Bible, Vol. II. p. 304.

people, and they raged with unbridled licentiousness, and wrought terrific misery. In England, it is true, the king was brought to the scaffold, and a civil war raged. But no such scenes of lawless violence and foul rioting were there enacted. All was conducted in the firmness and steadfastness of stern principle, deluded, it may have been, for a moment, mistaken, and perhaps turned somewhat aside by the mighty ruling of one ambitious mind—yet ever keeping liberty with Constitutional Law in view. And in our own country we have the noblest example of a Revolution conducted without excesses—of liberty working out her triumph, while yet bowing herself to her guardian law. And to what are these excellent characteristics to be largely traced? And what was it that enabled Britain, (and to some extent the remark will apply to our own country), so successfully to resist that tide of infidelity in religion, and radicalism in politics, which, acting in France both as a cause and a consequence of her bloody Revolution, seemed threatening to sweep away the people into a like gloomy vortex? It was the Bible—the Bible read among the people. Noble champions were raised up to defend the Bible: but it was doubtless the Bible itself, known to the people and read by them, that formed under God their great barrier and strong defence. Here let me quote the language of a recent English writer:—"Throughout the eighteenth century there had risen not one French mind of sufficient power and skill to gainsay and resist, so as to check the tide of Infidelity. No, it spread over the people, and swept all before it into one common ruin. And why? *The people in France* HAD NOT READ THE SCRIPTURES FOR THEMSELVES. A ceremonial religion, though supported by immense wealth, had proved to be no barrier. On British ground there was a difference. Her skeptics in succession, had every one of them, been looked hard in the face. From Herbert down to Hume and Paine, they had been fully met, exposed and overthrown; while Deism, false Philosophy and boasted human Reason, were not only tried by appeal to the oracles of God, but scrutinized as to their moral tendency, and found wanting. But why all this? or rather, why successful to whatever degree? We hesitate not to reply that there is but one answer. *The people in Britain* HAD LONG READ THE SCRIPTURES FOR THEMSELVES."¹

But I am dwelling too long on this point. Did time permit it would be interesting to illustrate it still farther: ad to trace the moral influence wrought through the instrumentality of

¹ Annals of Eng. Bible, Vol. II. p. 592.

the British and Foreign Bible Society, and our own beloved institution of a later date. The Bible is the noblest safeguard of a free people. The friend of human liberty, it is equally the enemy of licentiousness. It will elevate the mass while it enforces the supremacy of law. Its whole history has been the history of a benign influence, blessing mankind, advancing civilization, subduing barbarian rudeness and tyrannic oppression, nourishing all the sweet graces of domestic love and social kindness, purifying society, and promoting virtuous living and general refinement.

I come now to speak of the *Religious Influence* of the Bible—and this is the grandest aspect of our subject, and one to which no human mind can do complete justice. With its religious influence, its moral influence is closely connected, and indeed, upon it is greatly dependent. The Bible teaches us the *true Religion*, the religion of God. It is a light from heaven shining upon the path in which man gropes in darkness. It is the voice of an angel saying to the anxious multitudes who are crowded around the altar bearing the inscription, "*To the Unknown God*," "whom ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you." It alone makes known unto us the true God, and Jesus Christ whom He has sent—in the knowledge of whom standeth Eternal Life. The Bible alone points out to man the way of life. The Bible alone tells how JEHOVAH may be worshipped—how sin may be forgiven. The Bible alone assures us of immortality—answers the questionings of the soul—gives credible promise that the soul's anticipation of a coming judgment shall be realized—tells with authority of heaven and hell—and points to the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world. The Bible alone meets the wants of man and satisfies his desires. The religion of the Bible—the religion of God in Jesus Christ, is bread to the hungry, is water to the thirsty soul. It is the oil and wine poured by the good Samaritan into the wounds and bruises of the poor wayfarer. It is the Balm of Gilead that heals the soul's thirst. It is the staff of the aged. It is the guide of the young. It produces peace, begets patience, endues with courage, inspires with hope. It enriches the poor, and is to the rich man more precious than all his wealth. It is a religion for this life—a religion for eternity—a religion for the soul. And as such, intended for all men, proceeding from the God and Father of all, it is adapted unto all; and in the blessed Book, is God's most glorious plan of saving men set forth, in language so plain that all may understand, and on terms so gracious that none need perish.

"O how unlike the complex works of man,
Heaven's easy, artless, unencumbered plan!
No meretricious graces to beguile,
No clustering ornaments to clog the pile;
From ostentation, as from weakness, free,
It stands, like the cerulean arch we see,
Majestic in its own simplicity.
Inscribed above the Portal, from afar
Conspicuous as the brightness of a star,
Legible only by the light they give,
Stand the soul quickening words: "*Believe and Live.*"

When we pause for a moment to consider this aspect of our subject we are overwhelmed with its magnitude. When we regard the human race as sunk in sin, yet every man immortal—when we see the millions bowing to grievous and debasing superstitions, toiling under the burdens of this life, and hurrying to eternity to meet a tribunal at which they must plead guilty,—and then behold in this precious volume the means of lifting them up from the depths of sin, of giving them peace and contentment under the cares of life, and especially of delivering them from condemnation, and preparing them for a happy immortality—how can we estimate its value or find language to speak of its importance to mankind. Select one individual out of the countless multitudes of human beings to whom to apply the benefits of the Holy Book, and let that one, if you choose, be taken from the mass whose lot is poverty and toil: and marking the blessed influence of the Bible in this one case—seeing it giving patience, and resignation, and cheerfulness to the soul, ennobling the character, making life glad with peace of mind, and joy in believing, and sustaining with the bright hope of "a treasure in the skies:"—and then letting the mind run on to contemplate that treasure, rich and everlasting:—just think of the millions on millions who have been, and may yet be made partakers of the same blessings; and of the millions on millions now without the Bible; and say,

"Shall we whose souls are lighted
With wisdom from on high,
Shall we to men benighted,
The Lamp of Life deny?"

But let it be remembered that it is of the *Silent Influence* of the Bible that we are speaking; that is, of the influence which it exerts in itself without the aid of oral teaching, or the written expositions of men. And this is of special importance to a society, whose great business it is to circulate the Holy Scriptures "without note or comment." The great fact

is not overlooked that God has appointed "the ministry of reconciliation," as the instrument for the conversion of sinners; that it has pleased Him "by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." Neither do we forget, that it is the province of the Holy Spirit to renew the heart of fallen man, and bring him to his God. But it is a fact of the utmost importance, and affording the highest encouragement for zealous perseverance in the work of disseminating the Word of Life, that the Bible itself, without external aids, is often the means of producing conversions—of transforming the servants of sin into children of the most High God. It carries with it a power which, silently exerted, is deeply felt. We need not speculate with theologians about the inherent power of the letter of the Sacred Volume, nor discuss the question, whether the Holy Spirit invariably accompanies the written word. It is enough for us to know that the Bible, alone, in its simplicity, without the preacher or the expositor has led men unto God in Christ. Facts abundantly testify to this. Instances of such a nature have probably come under the observation of many of us.

I have seen a man of intelligence and uprightness, reading for years his Bible, and escaping from the snares of the adversary, deriving silently and gradually therefrom his convictions, his penitence, his faith, his devout obedience.

I watched the dying of an aged man who had long read the Bible, yet refused to give up his sins; and who had often scoffed at its holy teachings: and I marked in the yielding of his soul, in his acknowledgments almost unwillingly given, and at last in the trembling outstretching of the hand of faith, a striking testimony to the silent working of the Holy Word.

A young man of talents, and bright promise, yet without a proper faith in Christ, was arrested by disease; and in his bed of suffering the Bible became his teacher, and by degrees his chief companion; and it made all his bed in his sickness, and flung the light of heaven over his departing soul.

How often has a single passage of the Holy Volume fixed itself in the mind and worked silently and powerfully there! How often has the reading of one of the Gospels wrought mighty changes! Is not the silent influence of the Bible remarkably evinced in the numbers who, reading it secretly, were enabled by the strength which it afforded, to endure the pains of persecution, some of them even unto death? Nay, was it not the reading of the Holy Volume which, under God's grace, lifted Luther out of the depths in which he might otherwise have remained? Did not the perusal of the Holy Book kindle a fire within his soul, which burned and blazed until

Europe and the world saw the light and felt the heat? And was it not a fitting and noble return which he, Bible-enlightened, and by the Bible set free, made to God, in giving the Bible unto his countrymen, that it might likewise burn in their souls, and be to every household a pillar of fire for their guidance and defence?

It is related of the noted Earl of Rochester, whom one of his biographers describes as "a great wit, a great sinner, and a great penitent," that, "Reading the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, he was convinced of the truth and inspiration of the Scriptures, the Deity of the Messiah, and the value of his atonement as a rock on which sinners may build their hopes of salvation. On that atonement he rested, and died in the humble expectation of pardoning mercy and heavenly happiness."

The following incident is related upon good authority:—"Mr. Robert Aitkin, a bookseller of Philadelphia, was the first person who printed a Bible in that city. While he kept a book-store, a person called on him, and inquired if he had Paine's "Age of Reason" for sale. He told him he had not; but having entered into conversation with him and found that he was an infidel, he told him that he had a better book than Paine's "Age of Reason," which he usually sold for a dollar, but would lend it to him, if he would promise to read it: and after he had actually read it, if he did not think it worth a dollar, he would take it again. The man consented, and Mr. Aitkin put a Bible into his hands. He smiled when he found what book he had engaged to read, but said he would perform his engagement. He did so: and when he had finished the perusal, he came back and expressed his deepest gratitude for Mr. Aitkin's recommendation of the book, saying it had made him, what he was not before, a happy man; for he had found in it the way of salvation through Christ. Mr. Aitkin rejoiced in the event, and had the satisfaction of knowing that this reader of the Bible, from that day to the end of his life, supported the character of a consistent christian, and died with a hope full of immortality."

A distributor of a Bible Association in the State of New York, "called at a house where he met with an angry repulse. The man of the house was full of 'cursing and bitterness;' he would not suffer a Bible to be left at his house. 'If left any where,' said he, 'it shall be left at the barn.' 'Very well,' the distributor meekly replied, 'I do not know that I could select a better place for it: our blessed Saviour once lay in a manger!' He went quickly to the barn and deposited the sacred

treasure in a safe place, with much prayer that it might bless even him who would not allow it to remain in his house. The man struck with the unexpected reply of the distributor, was led to think of his own rashness and guilt, and especially of the Saviour's Birth-place. After two or three days his distress became so great, that he went out to the barn in search of the rejected volume. He turned to the passage which records the circumstances connected with the Birth of the Redeemer, and wept, and, it is hoped, repented, and consecrated himself to God through faith in Christ. 'The once spurned book now found a place, not only in his house, but its truths were received into his heart and controlled his life.'

Many more facts of this kind might easily be mentioned, showing conclusively, that there is a wonder-working power in the Holy Bible. Let me call your attention to two others, similar in their character to these already stated, yet possessing some peculiarities. The first opens to our minds a view of the immense amount of good that may be accomplished by means of a single copy of the Scriptures.

"A Romish Catholic Priest lived in Yucatan, about the end of the last century and near to the British Settlement, who was in the habit of reading and preaching from a Spanish Bible, which somehow had fallen into his possession. He was forbidden to do so, but persevered, and was cast into prison, where he was left to die. His old house-keeper got his Bible, read from it to the villagers and young people, who assembled around her on the feast days of the church. She not only instructed them, but was often sent for by the dying. The Bible was left to a young woman who was the pupil of this house-keeper, and who with others, when advanced in life, came seeking books from Mr. Henderson in Belize. Discovering an instructed mind, and unusual regard for the Scriptures, inquiry was made, and the preceding facts came out in explanation. Here was a Bible passing through three generations, and blessing each, and yet for fifty years, the good it had done was unknown beyond its immediate hearers."¹

"The late Rev. Dr. Corrie, Bishop of Madras, was formerly the Chaplain of Allahabad. At that time there was no Hindostanee version of the Scriptures; and it was his custom to translate, on small bits of paper, striking passages of Scripture into that language, and every morning distribute these papers at his door. Twenty years after, he received a communication from a Missionary at Allahabad, who informed him that a per-

¹ Day Spring, April 1847.

son in ill health had arrived there, and that he had been to visit him. He had come to see his friends and die among them, after an absence of more than twenty years. The missionary had visited him there several times, and was so astonished at his knowledge of the Scriptures, and his impressions of its great realities, that he put the question—"How is it, my friend, that you are so well informed in the Sacred Scriptures? You have told me that you have never seen a Missionary in your life, nor any one to teach you the way of life and salvation!" And what was his answer? He put his hand behind his pillow, and drew out a bundle of well worn and tattered bits of paper, and said: "From these bits of paper which a *sahib* distributed at his door, whom I have never seen since, have I learned all. These papers which I received twenty years ago, and have read every day, till they are thus tumbled and spoiled are passages of Scripture in the Hindostanee language, from them I have derived all the information on eternal realities which I now possess. This is the source of my information; thus I have derived my knowledge."¹

What testimony, my brethren, does God bear to his word! How has he blessed it! What encouragement have we here for labor! What a power resides in the Holy Volume! And in view of its silent influence, of its most blessed effects, may we not exclaim, in the eloquent language of another: "What sort of Book is this, that even the winds and waves of human passion obey it? What other engine of social improvement has operated so long, and yet lost none of its virtue? Since it appeared, many boasted plans of amelioration have been tried and failed; many codes of jurisprudence have arisen and run their course and expired. Empire after empire has been launched on the tide of time, and gone down leaving no trace on the waters. But this Book is still going about doing good—leavening society with its holy principles—cheering the sorrowful with its consolations—strengthening the tempted, encouraging the penitent, calming the troubled spirit, and soothing the pillow of death. Can such a Book be the offspring of human genius? Does not the vastness of its effects demonstrate the excellency of the power to be of God?"

Such, my hearers, is the Bible: and such its influence: so rich in blessings, so precious to the soul. What lover of his country will not aid in its distribution? What lover of mankind will not seek to give it to all the world? What christian

¹ *Ib.* p. 42.

heart is not filled with desire that all men may partake of the royal gift—earth's solace, and the guide to heaven?

Such is the Bible; and daily, hourly are we drinking from the rich streams of its blessings. It is to us the ark of God's covenant. It is the Shekinah in our tabernacles—the visible token of God's presence with us. Oh let us not forget our indebtedness, nor fail to make thank-offerings unto Him who gives it to us!

Such is the Bible; wherever it goes silently, but powerfully exerting its happy influence—expanding the intellect, purifying the morals, elevating the character, solacing the woes, breaking the fetters of mankind; strengthening liberty with the support of law; throwing away the burdens of superstition and idolatry; allaying the fears of awakened conscience, and guiding perishing souls to everlasting salvation.

We have this Bible—but oh! how many millions of our race are destitute of it!

In 1834 it was estimated that the whole number of Bibles in the world was not more than *Twenty* millions. If we suppose that the yearly issue in the world, for the last fourteen years, has averaged *five* millions, which is probably a large estimate, we should have the amount of ninety millions. But this amount must be very considerably reduced by an allowance for books worn out, or otherwise destroyed. Supposing the number, however, at present, in the world to be ninety millions, and estimating the population of the world at one thousand millions; we behold nine hundred and ten millions of our race, immortal as we are, destitute of the Word of Life—that word which alone tells of Jesus Christ! Or supposing, which is far from being the case, that the Bibles were distributed one to each family, taking five as the average number of the family—there would then be one hundred and ten millions of families, or five hundred and fifty millions of souls without a Bible!

I need not detain you by speaking of the heathen nations who bow down to idols, and are sunk in the worst forms of superstition; where woman is treated as a brute; where the car of Juggernaut rolls over its deluded victims; and the widow is burned at the husband's funeral pile, and children are thrown into the muddy stream, or buried alive in the earth; where weary pilgrimages are performed, and poor burdened human beings torture their bodies for the sake of their souls.

But the estimate just made presents us the startling fact, that there are millions nominally christian, and living in civilized lands who are without the Bible! Oh what a call on Christ-

ian benevolence and activity! It is altogether probable, that the number of inhabitants in Great Britain, and the United States would be fully equal to the whole number of Protestant Bibles in the world — certainly, if to this number the people of Germany be added, the amount will fully equal that of the Bibles.

But we may come still nearer home — and while the cry for the Bible comes to us from crowded China, and teeming India, and the mountains of Palestine and Persia, and France and Italy are opening avenues for its entrance among the people, our land is full of waste places! Yes! this land, so much blessed, and so much owing to the Bible its blessedness, contains thousands of families destitute of the Bible! It is estimated that the annual issue of Bibles and Testaments in our land, is about equal to the annual increase of our population. But of this issue a large part is exported to other lands. Besides there is the constant demand arising from the wearing out and loss of volumes. So that the supply is far from equaling the demand. Had the American Bible Society sufficient funds, it might readily double its issues, and yet not be able to meet the wants of the people. But it must be remembered, that the work of the Bible Society is not simply to furnish Bibles to those who apply for them; but also to seek out the destitute and offer them the Bread of Life—to bring the Holy Word before the minds of many who would otherwise never see it, and be unblest by its precious influence. Various motives deter the destitute from seeking a supply; and it becomes our business to present the supply in their own homes. It has been found that the work of exploration and distribution must be repeated once in *five* years. Many persons are inclined to think that there is no destitution in their immediate neighborhood: but investigations often show this to be a mistaken opinion. Unless a thorough exploration and distribution have recently been made in this borough and vicinity, I doubt not you will find many in need of Bibles among you and around you. An agent in Massachusetts, the home of the Puritans, and a centre of light, says: "In one place I found a family married eight years which had never a Bible, and seven others within one mile *where the minister said there could be no destitution*. Prominent persons in all the towns were very confident I should find no families destitute near there. But in visiting I found such in every town, and almost in every neighborhood; some under the droppings of the Sanctuary, and in densely populated streets." Of your own State it is said: "Notwithstanding Pennsylvania was reported

as supplied in 1845, still we find the demand for the Word increasing every year. Those counties that were supplied in 1843-4 are now engaged in a re-supply, and find large destitutions. In Fayette County, 688 families were destitute, and supplied; and over 4,000 youths were supplied with the New Testament. This County was supplied in 1843. In addition to the 688 Bibles disposed of in that County to families destitute, over 800 copies were sold to families requiring additional copies. In Green County over 400 families were found destitute and supplied. In Warren County were found 300 families destitute out of 1500 visited, equal to one-fifth. These are fair specimens of the destitutions where investigation is made. And this too in those Counties which were supplied in 1843 and 1844. Facts like these teach us that we have no stopping place in the Bible work. Supply a County thoroughly the present year, and if the County is explored even the succeeding year, a considerable destitution is found."¹

But my own interest in the subject is causing me, I fear, to weary my audience, and I hasten to a conclusion. The course of thought which we have pursued makes it abundantly evident, that the Bible-cause appeals to us by every motive of patriotism, philanthropy, benevolence, and Christian duty. If there be any cause worthy to awaken an interest, and enlist our sympathy, and call out our liberal contributions, it is this. In this cause all may unite. In this work of the Lord differences of name and sentiment may be forgotten. Around this Holy Ark, the different tribes of Christian Israel may arrange themselves with their several banners, yet feel themselves to be but one people, and sing one song of praise to the Redeeming God. In aiding this cause all may unite in fulfilling the mission of the Lord Jesus, in the proclamation of glad tidings to all the world. Do you need an *argument*, my hearers? Here is one simple, and incontrovertible. The Bible is God's blessing to mankind — the Book of life-giving influences to the world. You have the Bible; millions of your fellow-beings have it not. How plain, how solemn, how imperative your duty! Do you need *incitement*? Think once more of the blessings of the Bible, and of the destitute; and while your own table is covered with the Bread of Life, will you not throw some crumbs to the hungry? To use a beautiful figure, though not the language of another: while the manna falls thickly around your camp, and the pure water from the smit-

¹ Am. Bible Society Report, 1847, p. 125.

ten rock refreshes your souls, will you not remember the parched and famishing wayfarers in the wilderness, and bid them welcome to a share in your blessings? "Freely ye have received: freely give."

Do you ask for *encouragement*? It is abundant. Good has been done. Every Bible is doing good. Every person, who contributes to this cause, is doing a most noble work of goodness. Find your encouragement in the influence you may thus be able to exercise for the benefit of your country, for the good of your fellow-citizens, and your fellow-men. Find it in the contemplation of the silent influence of each copy of the Sacred Volume, which you may be the means of placing in the hand of a destitute fellow being. Find it in the consciousness of doing good. Find it in the anticipation of a glorious future. All who, with a proper love to God, and in the spirit of the blessed Volume, aid in sending it forth throughout the earth, shall participate in the gladness of that day, when the ransomed of the Lord shall come to Zion; when earth's miseries all finished, earth's darkness all dispelled, the King, even He who once, though He was rich, for our sakes became poor that we through his poverty might be made rich; the King shall sit upon his holy hill of Zion, and around him shall be assembled all his faithful ones, and pointing to this and that abode that was blessed by His Word, shall say, "Well done, ye blessed, inasmuch as ye did it unto these, ye did it unto me."

May the hearts of all present be favorably disposed towards this good cause, and may the Society here convened be blessed with extensive usefulness, through God's abounding grace.

AMEN.

ARTICLE IV.

THE CIRCUMSTANCES ATTENDING THE FIRST ADMISSION OF THE GENTILES INTO THE CHURCH.

By the Rev. C. W. Schaeffer A. M., Germantown, Pa.

THE Acts of the Apostles not only record the practice of the first preachers of the Gospel, it also develops various principles, which both belong to the foundation of the church, and mark its progress in all subsequent times. The agency of the Holy Spirit, the power of prayer, the nature and efficacy of entire

consecration, on the part of the Lord's people, are ruling features of that interesting history.

The conversion of the Gentiles and their admission to the privileges of the Church of God, peculiarly connected, as it is, with the interests of the church in all ages and amongst all people, might be considered as deserving special attention. The prophecies of the Old Testament, concerning the Gentiles, had been so numerous and diversified, that nothing but the partial blindness of Israel, 'we suppose, could have prevented them from entertaining a general expectation of the speedy accession of all nations to the kingdom of God.

The directions given by our Lord to his Apostles, appear to us to be so plain and simple, that we might have expected to see the Apostles, without any further communications from above, going forth to the lands of the Heathen, and in the exercise of their ministry adding men and women every where to the Lord. Yet, the remarkable events, so full of Divine agency, that opened the door of faith to the Gentiles, show how slow the Apostles were to understand, and how backward to execute the will of God respecting the Heathen.

In the series of events thus referred to, the first is the conversion of a man who, possessed of a cultivated intellect, yet marked by bigotry and strong passions, had rendered himself notorious by the malignant persecutions with which he followed up the disciples of Jesus. The connection of his conversion with the purposes of God respecting the Gentiles, is distinctly presented in the communication made to Ananias of Damascus, Acts 9, and in the commission given to Saul himself. Acts 26. "He is a chosen vessel to bear my name before the Gentiles and Kings," "to whom I now send thee, to open their eyes and turn them from darkness to light," &c.

In this event two things are manifest. It was brought about, not by the ordinary operations of Grace, but by an extraordinary interposition of Divine Power; and its avowed object was the accomplishment of certain specific purposes in the Gentile world. By this event then, the chief agent for commencing and carrying on the work of gathering in the nations was secured.

Two other circumstances yet remained, the proper disposal of which, on the part of the Head of the Church, seems to have been necessary, in order to turn the zeal of the laborer, thus secured, to good account in the conversion of the Gentile world. The first was, that the spirit of inquiry should be awakened in the breasts, at least of some of the Heathen themselves — the other, that the Apostles should be set free

from their exclusive Jewish prejudices, and become willing to admit the Gentiles to the Church, upon the ground of faith alone.

As the necessity for a laborer was met in the person of Saul, so the circumstances just referred to were disposed of, in the persons of Cornelius and Peter respectively.

That there were other Gentiles whose minds were as open for the reception of the truth as was that of Cornelius, need not be questioned. The Holy Spirit saw proper to bring him forward as the first fruits of the Gentile world.

Cornelius is introduced to us as a Roman centurion; it may be, a Roman, at least an Italian by birth. His profession as a soldier, and his official dignity as the commander of a considerable body of Italian troops, might be considered as inconsistent with the possession of a devout and humble spirit. Accordingly his evangelical inclination, which under any circumstances would have been interesting, must be regarded, on this account, as the more illustrious. The Spirit of the Lord had a work to accomplish for his own glory in the Church; and before that Spirit the crooked is made straight, and the rough places become smooth. In spite of all the hindrances to piety, by which he must have been surrounded, Cornelius was nevertheless a man of deep and long-tried devotion.

As we believe, that God, in drawing men towards the truth, generally operates upon their minds by the use of means, it would be interesting to know the agency by which the mind of Cornelius was at length led into his state of anxious inquiry. What these means were we do not pretend to determine. But it is remarkable, from what various quarters, the Providence of God had long been operating so as to prepare the Gentile world for the reception of the Gospel. From all of these possibly, from some of them certainly, the mind of Cornelius was reached.

(a) Neander, in his General History of the Church, has given a clear and interesting account of the influence of the Platonic Philosophy, in turning the attention of reflecting Gentiles to things heavenly and divine. It was one of the principles of this Philosophy, that man was not a transient apparition, but a being destined for a higher development; and, that the present life was but a stage preparatory to a loftier existence. The Platonists were prone to hunt up, in the preceding history of humanity, traces of a commerce between heaven and earth, and the idea of a divine revelation, conveyed to man, under many diversified forms, was one most

agreeable to them. As a result of this philosophical system, there was felt every where, the necessity of some revelation from above, that would convey to inquiring minds that peace, which the former conflicting systems of Philosophy and Religion had never been able to secure. Even Porphyry, the zealous defender of the old religious systems, as quoted by Neander, has asserted this in his collection of ancient oracles, prepared by him as the basis of a better theology. Referring to this production he remarks: "the utility of such a work will be best understood by those, who with painful anxiety, have longed for some divine revelation, which, by its faithful communications, might give them peace from trouble."

As a tangible illustration of these mental conflicts, by which reflecting men had their attention directed towards the faith of the Gospel, the history already referred to, has given us a quotation from the Clementina. Though a mere romance, the work may be regarded as a fair representation of many scenes of real life; and though belonging to the second or third century, it is equally trust-worthy, as an exposition of the mental conflicts of earlier ages.

The author of the Clementina has thus related the experience of Clement, a member of a noble family of Rome:—"From my early youth I was perplexed with doubts and anxieties of mind, of which I understood not the source. Shall I be annihilated in death, and entirely forgotten? When was the world made, and what existed before the Creation? What shall be after the end of the world? Shall there be some state of existence, of which it is now impossible to conceive?—Ceaselessly followed up by such perplexities, I was so tortured, that health and spirit began to fail me. But I knew not then, what I afterwards discovered, that in these anxieties, I had a faithful leader, by whose agency God was conducting me to eternal life. Under these circumstances, I often envied those who seemed to enjoy the bliss of ignorance. Troubled by such anxieties, from my youth, I sought to relieve my mind by attending upon the schools of the Philosophers.—There, however, I saw nothing but the building up and tearing down of principles. One while the immortality of the soul was proved; again its mortality was demonstrated. Thus borne hither and thither by every wind, my confusion was ever increasing, and I sighed deeply in the bitterness of my soul." Clement resolved then upon visiting Egypt, the land of mysteries and of spiritual apparitions; but was deterred by the calm suggestions of an intelligent friend. In this state

of mind he heard the preaching of the Gospel, and it came home to his heart, in demonstration of the Spirit and of power.

This, though we may esteem it as but an imaginary case, may nevertheless be regarded, as upon the whole, a faithful account of many cases in real life; and in this manner the very barrenness and insufficiency of the religious systems of the Gentiles, was used as a means to prepare the way for the entrance in of the Gospel. This was the asking and the seeking that must precede the receiving and the finding.

Of course, in the absence of direct testimony upon the subject, we cannot determine whether Cornelius was or was not exercised in this particular manner. It is sufficient, however, to know that many thoughtful and serious minds among the Gentiles were, during the Apostolic age, directed in this way, towards the reception of the Gospel.

(b) An influence favorable to Christianity flowed also from the frequent residence of the Jews, and the wide diffusion of Jewish theology, in the lands of the Gentiles. Those who belonged to the sect of the Pharisees were especially active, and with great success, in making proselytes to the Jewish faith. Some learned men have distinguished two kinds of proselytes, which distinction, though not warranted by Scripture history, may yet be found convenient. These are 1) the proselytes of Righteousness or Justice; 2) the proselytes of the Gate. The proselytes of Righteousness were those Gentiles who, upon embracing the Jewish faith, had been circumcised and adopted the whole ceremonial law of the Jews. In many cases, they gave themselves up without reserve to Jewish superstitions and fanaticism, and became the blind followers of their own blind guides. These proselytes were often the most malignant enemies of Christianity, and were found, by those Christians who encountered their rage, to be as the Lord described them, twofold more the children of hell than their preceptors themselves.

The proselytes of the Gate, on the contrary, formed, upon the whole, a more promising class. Acquainted with the Sacred writings of the Jews, they adopted many of the most important doctrines of the Scriptures without becoming Jews themselves. Having heard of the promised Messiah, they shared with others in an anxiety to see him; and as they had not been blinded by the prevailing prejudices of the Jews, they were the more open to the approaches of the Gospel. These were the devout men, and the men who feared God, to whom the Scriptures refer, as belonging not to the house of Israel but to the Gentile world.

Such also was the character of Cornelius as described by the historian. His faith in God and in the Providence of God, had ripened into fervent and importunate prayer; whilst the truth he had already embraced served only to increase his hungering for a fuller revelation.

Thus the Spirit of the Lord had been operating, through the ministry of the ancient prophets, to break up the fallow-ground of the Gentiles, and prepare them for receiving the good seed of the Kingdom of Heaven. Those holy and venerable men who, by their living ministry, had so often sought alas, so often in vain, to restore the wanderings of Israel, and to lead them in the way of truth, though now dead were yet speaking. Their words were at length, in the very spirit of the Gospel, going out into all the world, and every one of them was still echoing among the nations, the cry that had but lately arrested the attention of Israel, "prepare ye the way of the Lord make his paths straight."

(c) An additional channel of approach to the Gentiles was opened by the direct preaching of the Gospel to the Jews, in their own land. That same Providence which had led many of the house of Israel beyond the limits of their own land, and so used them as bearers of an awakening light to benighted nations, also conducted many strangers and foreigners to take up their abode within the inheritance of the holy people.

Established in Judea, mainly, for civil or military purposes, they were, of course, cognizant of all events, the general importance of which was such as to arrest public attention or to influence the public mind. The Gentiles were there, and shared largely in the scenes of the Crucifixion. There, 'tis said, Pilate and Herod made friends. It was true, also, in a larger sense, viz. of the nations they represented. Jews and Gentiles were one in the indignities they heaped upon the head of the Son of God. They were one in the tardy acknowledgment of his worth. Jews decently disposed of his remains, and Gentiles, in the moment in which he breathed his last, pronounced him the Son of God (Mark 15: 39). Why, then, should they not be one, at least, as hearers of the Gospel which was afterwards preached in his name?

Simultaneously, therefore, with the annunciation of the doctrines of the Gospel by the Apostles of our Lord, to the house of Israel, many of the Gentiles also heard the strange tidings; and as they possessed human sympathies, and shared with the Jews in human interests, they would be likely to feel, as did the Jews, the entrance of the word into their hearts.

We have undoubtedly evidence that such was particularly the case with Cornelius. The Apostle Peter, whilst preaching to him, speaks of the Gospel as a matter that had already been published throughout all Judea and Galilee, and as a matter, with which Cornelius himself was, in a measure, acquainted. (Acts 10: 37.) He enjoyed, at least, some of the crumbs that fell from the Master's table; and in a mind capable of relishing these, the taste of them must only have begotten a desire for more.

Thus, then, by a remarkable variety of agencies, proceeding from the schools of Philosophy, the writings of the Prophets, the frequent intercourse between Jews and Gentiles, both at home and abroad, the Providence of God was preparing the nations for the reception of the Word, and opening the door for its entrance in among them.

'Tis looked upon as a wonderful illustration of Divine Providence, that the wants and necessities of society have, of late years, brought to light and developed means and materials of human comfort and happiness, which, unless these necessities had existed, might still have remained imbedded in their original darkness. The distant and remote operations of that Providence, harmonize perfectly with its later developments; and what was done in secret, in former generations, is now revealed, as having been wisely ordered, because necessary to its present purposes. Were we to say, it is no less an evidence of Divine Providence, that means and agencies were put to work, at remote points, and at early periods, among the Gentiles, the effect of which was to incline many to receive the truth of God, as soon as it should be ready to be revealed to them, we should thus suggest an analogy that might be fairly insisted upon as the very expression of truth and soberness.

As we have seen, the chief agent for operating among the Gentiles was already secured. In this manner also, and by these various causes, the minds of many were so affected as to be willing to give heed to the things he might have to say. Another circumstance, however, remained yet to be provided for. It was all important that the Church should open its doors, and be willing to admit the Gentiles upon the ground of faith in Christ alone.

The Apostles and Christian brethren were entrusted with weighty responsibilities in the church. It was therefore necessary that they should be made to see, and fall in with the designs of God on behalf of the Gentiles. Their feelings, as Jews, in favor of the law and institutes of Moses, were so strong, that they might be fitly described as prejudices. They

knew the promises given to the Gentiles; but they looked upon those promises only through the medium of the Mosaic law; and in their opinion, the conversion of the Gentiles to Christianity had, of necessity, to be preceded by their conversion to the Jewish faith. To admit the Gentiles as such to the Church would, they supposed, be practically throwing contempt upon the ordinances and precepts which God himself had given to the Fathers, and they would not endure the thought of increasing their own numbers, by admitting any immunity from the rites and duties of the Mosaic law. Their system, therefore, contemplated the conversion of the Gentiles to the Jewish faith first, and their introduction to the Christian Church afterwards, not as Gentiles but as Jews. So stoutly were some, not a few, inclined to insist upon this, that after the Apostles had long been laboring with success among the Gentiles, they were often hindered in their work by the interference of the so-called Judaizing Christians, who boldly proclaimed to the Gentiles that unless they would adopt the law of Moses, unless they would be circumcised they could not be saved. (Acts 15: 1.)

The fact of the admission of Cornelius to Christian fellowship by the ministry of Peter, astonished, seems to have shocked the brethren and Apostles in Judea; and when Peter went up to Jerusalem they hesitated not to reprove him for holding fellowship with men who had not been circumcised. Peter, in his defence, acknowledges the apparent reasonableness of their objections. He intimates what they well knew, that he himself had entertained the same opinions once; but he continues to rehearse how he had been directed by a vision and a voice from heaven to abandon them, — in short, how he was convinced, that to carry out these views in the administration of the Church would be nothing less than fighting against God. (Acts 11: 1-17.)

The Apostles then themselves, in their subjective views of the Gospel, were decided in their disposition to insist upon the observance of the Mosaic law, as a condition, without which the Gentiles could not be admitted to the fellowship of Christ. A divine communication was necessary to relieve them of this error; and Peter was the person to whom that communication was directly given.

The agency of Peter, in this important operation, harmonizes well with the whole development of his character, as discovered in other portions of his history. He stands chief among the three who witnessed the glory of the Transfiguration. He was first among the twelve to answer the question,

"Whom do ye say that I am?" He was most prominent among them that planted and watered when the Pentecostal increase was bestowed; and who but he should be expected to go forward under the Divine guidance and take a position among the Gentiles, to which others would be, for a season, afraid even to follow him?

A divine Revelation, however, was necessary to make Peter himself willing to admit the Heathen to the blessings of the Gospel, and such a Revelation was granted to him.

In the prosecution of his ministry, Peter had gone down to Joppa, a city of note, upon the Eastern shore of the Mediterranean Sea. It was there that Dorcas, remembered and lamented in death for her alms-deeds and benevolence, had been restored to life through his agency. After this event, many of the inhabitants believed in the Lord. Such was the demand of inquiring souls for his instructions, and such the success of his efforts that he continued there many days.

During those days of diligent and successful labor, Peter was also much engaged in devotion. He labored as though every thing depended upon himself; he prayed, as though nothing could be accomplished without the blessing of God. On a certain occasion, about mid-day, he went up to the house-top, his mind deeply and anxiously agitated about the spiritual interests of all that region, and even of the regions beyond. In the scenes through which his mind was hurried, there were both Jews and Gentiles before him. The conversion and admission of both to the faith and privileges of the Gospel, could hardly fail to engage his attention. The course to be pursued with converts from the house of Israel was plain, not so the mode of dealing with converts from heathenism. His early, steadfast views, and all his Jewish education, urged him to require of them a complete and cordial submission to the ordinances of the law of Moses. But was this required by the Gospel? Had it been so determined by the Master himself? Was it expedient or proper for him to assume and combine the several distinct offices of a minister of the Gospel and, literally, a minister of circumcision? Were facts such as to indicate that so-called proselytes of Righteousness would become zealous followers of Jesus? It would be a mournful undertaking to reject a Gentile convert, who, though sincere in his faith in Jesus, should be unwilling to adopt and submit to the law of Moses; but it would be a fearful attempt to admit such a man to the household of faith, in a way that should practically set at nought the Divine and venerable ordinances of the ancient household itself.

Thus swayed by violent conflicting impulses, the mind of the Apostle at length composed itself and sought relief in prayer. Meanwhile he became very hungry, and would have eaten; but the meal not being as yet prepared, he continued for a season under the cravings of appetite. Both body and mind being thus in a state of anxious suspense and longing, he fell into a trance or ecstasy, and so beheld a vision, the character and bearing of which, had a remarkable congruity with the existing condition both of his body and his mind. Hunger had pressed him, and so in his vision he saw a supply of food to satisfy it. But the character of the food was not such as would be likely to be suggested simply by the dreams of a hungry Israelite. His mind, his spirit had been perplexed concerning the admission of the Gentiles, as such, the unclean in connection with the house of Israel, into the privileges of the kingdom of God. Like Isaac he had seen the fire and the wood, and it was this that troubled him about what he did not yet understand, the bringing in of the sacrifice.

Thus, as the peculiar form of the vision was made to correspond with his bodily state, its spirit and character had a similar relation to the condition of his mind. Accordingly he saw a collection of all manner of beasts of the earth, let down in a vessel from heaven. Hereupon a voice was heard saying, "rise, Peter, kill and eat." His answer was just such as might be expected from a strict and conscientious Jew. The voice responding, informed him, that God had cleansed the unclean, and that henceforth he should no more despise or refrain from that which the law of Moses had taught him to regard as common. And, because the thing was established, this was done thrice, and the vessel was received up again into heaven.

The active mind of Peter began at once to ponder upon the meaning of the vision. At the same time the messengers from Cornelius arrived at the house, inquiring for him. The Spirit leaving him, afterwards to discover the relation between the vision and the present inquirers, bade him go with the men doubting nothing, because the Lord had sent them. Before his arrival at the house of Cornelius, his mind was made up, and he became satisfied of it as being the will of God, that he should no longer consider any Gentile as common or unclean.

Arrived at the house, he began, without delay or hesitation, to open up to Cornelius and his friends, the unsearchable riches. The Jewish converts, who accompanied him, were astonished as they saw that the Divine Gift of the Holy Ghost was bestowed upon these Gentiles; and all, with one accord agreed, that, Gentiles though they were, they should be at

once admitted by the administration of Baptism to the privileges of the kingdom of God.

Thus the way was at length opened. An act which Providence had long been contemplating was now performed; and its blessed influences would continue until the way of the Lord should be known upon earth, his saving health among all nations. Nothing now remained but for the rest of the Apostles and brethren of note to be satisfied with this act of Peter, so as to throw wide the door of faith to the Gentiles.

The account given them by Peter, at Jerusalem, was such as to silence all their objections; and when they heard it they held their peace and glorified God, saying, then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life.

During the progress of these events Saul had been in comparative retirement at Tarsus. The time having now arrived for the regular prosecution of the work in which he had been chosen to act as a chief agent, we might reasonably expect to see him brought forward into the field of labor. Nor is that expectation disappointed. The interesting events in the church at Antioch occasioned a demand for his presence. There, in connection with Barnabas, he labored a whole year with great success, and from that point he directed his footsteps to the remote cities and regions of the Gentiles.

The truth which the foregoing discussion seems to illustrate is, that though the duty of the Church appears to have been made sufficiently clear by the testimony of the Divine Word, yet it was further necessary that the Head of the Church himself should, by specific developments of his providence, open the way and raise up instruments for the performance of that duty. We have seen that providence displayed; we have seen how individuals and classes of men, how Jews and Gentiles are alike the subjects upon which it operates; we have seen how it makes the learning of the world, and the bounds of men's habitations, and the social commerce of families and kingdoms, all subservient to the execution of its purposes. It is the wide-spread, the varied, the universal, the continued superintendence of Him who filleth all in all.

Now it would not be considered fanciful, were we to say that these same elements or circumstances are no less necessary, at all times, to the successful publication of the truth throughout the world. Laborers, who are themselves men of God through sanctification of the Spirit, must be raised up for the word. A certain degree of interest and concern for their own welfare should be realized amongst the heathen them-

selves. The church, too, that holds the lively oracles, should be ready to greet with acclamations of joy the children of every clime, who, believing in Christ, shall bow before the living God, and wait for the coming of his Son.

These elements, it may be said, do exist at present; yet, when their proportions shall have become regular and full-grown, then only can men begin to look for a general gathering in.

ARTICLE V.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION. BROOK'S OVID.

PERHAPS no subject at this moment, not even the great question of Human Slavery, occupies more attention than the Education of the People. In our own State, and in the States immediately North and South of us, conventions have very recently assembled to discover, if possible, a solution to this most important problem: "How may the youth of our country best be educated?" and great labor and thought and eloquence have been engaged in the enquiry. Well were they all employed could a plan be devised that should fully satisfy the wants and wishes of the community; for the education of the young is second in importance only to the paramount enquiry, the question of all questions for immortal beings: "What must we do to be saved?" and subsidiary even to that. For if it be true, as it undeniably is, that Christianity is the religion of enlightened man, it will follow that one of the best means to advance Christianity is, to fit mankind for the comprehension of a scheme which even the angels desire to look into.

But apart from the consideration of what is expedient for the people at large, there is a question of scarcely inferior magnitude: What education is fitted for those who have time to devote to the object? What is the best education *per se*? For the masses the instruction must necessarily be confined within narrow bounds; but there is a favored minority on whom the providence of God has bestowed the power to choose the good and refuse the evil, whose duty it will be to give tone to the community in which they are placed, who will be expected to take the foremost places in the onward march; for every gift of God involves a solemn responsibility in its use. What is for them the best discipline of mind? How shall they best be trained? Now it has again and again been de-

cided by the all but universal suffrage of those whose opinions are entitled to respect, that the wisdom of man has yet devised no instrument of education of equal efficiency with the *thorough* study of the classical languages; and we lay particular emphasis on the word *thorough*, that we may be understood to take a firm stand against the miserable systems of study made easy, so prominent among the quackeries of the age. As in physical education, strength is not to be acquired by luxurious sloth, but by vigorous exercise, by calling every muscle into play, and rendering every fibre tense; so in the culture of the mind, power of intellect is the meed of strong exertion. Stretch forth thy hand, said the voice divine, to the man whose withered arm was hanging powerless by his side, and, in the effort to obey, strength was given to him.

In early years, before the reasoning faculties are awakened, the child's memory is in full exercise, and the power of acquiring language seems greater than at any subsequent period of life. How soon the infant learns to prattle in its mother tongue! Nature herself seems to point out the early years of life as the most propitious for the study of language; the labor of committing grammatical formulæ, so irksome in after life, is then little felt: if parents and teachers would make the proper use of this unmistakeable indication, an advancement might be made, a sure position gained; then, as the higher powers of the mind gradually developed themselves, they would not be withdrawn from their legitimate objects; the whole mental education would thus be in harmony with nature, and we might reasonably hope to find among ourselves more frequent examples of that ripe scholarship for which our European kinsmen are renowned over the world. As it is, very few among us attain any competent mastery even of Latin, and still fewer of Greek; by far the more important language of the two, both from its intrinsic power and beauty, and the value and extent of the literature it embraces.

But here we are met by a danger of no small magnitude, against which it is the duty of the christian teacher to guard with the utmost solicitude. Whilst it is desirable, that youth should be made familiar with the great masterpieces of Classical Literature which have challenged the admiration, and received the suffrages of generation after generation, it has always been felt and lamented that the whole tone of these writings is heathen, in many parts directly hostile, and almost everywhere foreign to the teachings of the Gospel; a consideration which has made many pious men, from Gregory the Great to the friends of Adam Clarke, forbid the study. That

this apprehension is by no means groundless, the writer has experienced in his own person; for most assuredly he left school with a far better understanding of the heathen mythology, than of the Christian scheme of redemption; and he has no reason to suppose his case worse than that of most boys of his age; nay, it was probably better than that of many, for he was well acquainted with all the historical and narrative portions of the Scriptures, with all that boys can learn by continued reading with little or no explanation; he was early trained to respect God's Holy day, was a regular attendant in the sanctuary and not especially inattentive to the teachings of the pulpit, albeit, for the most part, beyond his comprehension. These were no small advantages; but we wish to impress on our readers that, notwithstanding all these advantages, the diligent and systematic instruction of the school-room being heathen rather than Christian in matter and tone, the natural result was, that what was rigorously and laboriously inculcated, made, for the time, the deeper impression. To such teaching, unquestionably, much of the practical heathenism of Europe in the last century is to be attributed; when, to say nothing of the ribald scoffers of France, for whose skepticism the inexcusable blending, by an apostate church, of apocryphal legends with the books of Holy Writ may be pleaded in extenuation, in Protestant England men, of cultivated intellects and philosophical minds, were found in the ranks of unbelievers; to such teaching it was owing that the thoughts of David Hume, even on his death-bed, were of Charon's boat, and that Charles James Fox

"When best employed and wanted most,"

passed from the scene of his earthly renown with the verses of the 4th *Æneid* in his ears, instead of the good tidings of great joy. This was, in great measure, the cause of the stoical torpidity of the English church, till aroused by the trumpet voices of the Wesleys and Whitfields; a torpidity hardly exceeded by that of the Italian churchmen in the days of Luther, when the sincere German monk was so deeply shocked at the impious hypocrisy of his fellow priest at the altar. True, the superior morality of England enforced more outward decorum; but our readers may judge what was the character of the instructions of the school-room, when, not many years since, a clergyman, and Head Master of a public Grammar School, while his congregation were expecting him in the pulpit on a Sunday morning, was found in his study reading Sophocles.

The question then returns upon us: What is to be done to remedy this great evil? To give us the inestimable advantage of a study, which has been mainly instrumental in forming the powerful minds of the great men of century after century, freed from the acknowledged dangers that surround it? How shall the christian scholar, and especially the christian minister, be educated? How shall the safe course be found between the shoals of ignorance and the rocks of infidelity? That such a way there is, is abundantly evidenced by the piety and learning of which, thanks be to God, the Christian Church has never been altogether destitute.

In the first place, we would earnestly recommend a total change of the text books for the earlier years of the school course. It is of very little consequence that the books used by the tyro should bear the impress of the Augustan age; and Southey well remarked, that our pigs are more rationally treated than our children. "I am sometimes inclined to think, that pigs are brought up upon a much wiser system than boys at a grammar school. The pig is allowed to feed upon any kind of offal, however coarse, on which he can thrive, till the time approaches when pig is to commence pork or take a degree as bacon; and then he is fed daintily. Now it sometimes appears to me, that, in like manner, boys might acquire their first knowledge of Latin, from authors very inferior to those which are now used in all schools, provided the matter were unexceptionable and the Latinity good;—and that they should not be introduced to the standard works of antiquity, till they are of an age in some degree to appreciate what they read." The suggestion, important even in relation to *Æsthetics*, becomes of a thousandfold more weight, when viewed as a religious one. While it is of little moment that the books, read in the earlier years of education, should be irreproachable in style, it is precisely at this period of incalculable importance that they should be irreproachable in matter. Nor is there any necessity for continuing the present custom. Ample selections of unexceptionable passages might be made even from the classical writers, and were we to exclude entirely all heathen writings, the early Christian literature furnishes abundant materials, as well in verse as in prose; and we are right glad to find that the attention of more than one branch of the Christian Church has been turned to this most interesting question. "With what propriety," asks the Principal of an Episcopal Institution in the preface to a little compilation intended partially to remedy the evil, "With what propriety do baptized youth spend years at the languages and never learn

a syllable of sacred Latin? Why should they be so familiar with *Tityre tu patula*; or *O Venus Regina*; and be entire strangers to *Te Deum Laudamus*, or *Veni Creator Spiritus*?" And that very little would be lost, even in style, by attention to Sacred Literature, is evidenced by many beautiful hymns in this little volume. We would gladly extract, in evidence of the assertion, Melancthon's Hymn De Angelis, but it is rather too long, and we select in preference St. Ambrose's Morning Hymn:

Jam lucis orto sidere
Deum precemur supplices
Nostras ut ipse dirigat
Lux increata, semitas.

Nil lingua, nil peccet manus
Nil mens inane cogitet:
In ore simplex veritas
In corde regnet caritas.

Incepta demo fluet dies,
O Christe, custos pervigil,
Quas sævus hostis obsidet
Portas tuere sensuum.

Præsta diurnus ut tuæ
Subserviat laudi labor:
Auctore quæ te cepimus
Da, te favente, prosequi.

Superba ne nimis caro
Menti licenter imperet
Carnis domet superbiam
Potus cibique parcitas.

Deo Patri sit gloria
Ejusque soli Filio,
Sancto simul cum Spiritu,
Nunc, et per omne seculum.

And such a text book as we contemplate might be made much more attractive and interesting to the juvenile mind, than the heathenized books at present in use, as it would consist of matter within their comprehension and in harmony with the best lessons of the home, the school and the church. Nor are we advocating mere experimental novelties, but simply a return to the wholesome mode of teaching of ages long past, when the school was watered by the droppings of the sanctuary and students were

"Not the mere children of these forward days,
But mild eyed boys just risen from their knees."

These suggestions, it can be scarcely necessary to repeat, have reference only to the earlier years of study. When the pupil

has acquired a stock of words and familiarity with the structure of sentences, there can be no substitute for the classical authors. But we contend that the great benefits which are to be looked for from familiarity with works stamped with the approbation of so many centuries, will be much more certainly attained when their study is associated with high intellectual pleasure, instead of mere dictionary drudgery, and repulsive task work, ill understood and studiously forgotten. Had Lord Byron been thus taught, we should never have witnessed in his case the anomaly of a man of his poetic temperament being disgusted with the sweet odes of Horace, and, more than probably, this early training might, under the Divine blessing, have been the means of giving a totally different direction to his poetic fancy, and his great powers might have been employed in celebrating the praises of the God who bestowed them.

But it may be said, if these heathen writings are after all to be studied we shall gain very little by the delay; that we shall at best but somewhat diminish an evil which ought to be totally eradicated; and we shall probably be asked how we propose to purify these corrupted streams, and convert a poison into nutriment. This must in some measure be the work of the class-room, and the christian preacher should always be anxious to impress his class, not only with his finer apprehension of the peculiar beauties of his author, but with his reverence for the great truths of religion; and many a passage in the heathen writer, perhaps by the very force of contrast, will minister the occasion. There should be neither asperity nor gloom, but a wholesome, cheerful, religiousness should pervade all his instructions. In addition to this the Church needs christianized editions of all the school Classics. Not merely expurgated editions; — no mere omission of obscene passages will reach the seat of the disease. All such passages must be carefully excided, and the knife used with unsparing hand. This is but a small part of an editor's duty, yet even this is sometimes shamefully neglected. We have at present before us a copy of Horace prepared expressly for the use of schools, by an editor of great name and reputation, in which all the feculent impurities of the writer, that had been removed by previous editors, appear to have been carefully replaced. Nor do we wish a constant repetition of religious ejaculation, whether there is a peg to hang it on or not; but we would have and we must have, at all appropriate places, a decided Christian tone given to the editor's comments. We do not know many books which will illustrate our mean-

ing; nay we hardly know one except the recent edition of Ovid, by the learned President of the Wesleyan Female College, of Baltimore; with a few remarks on which, we will leave the whole subject to the serious reflections of the friends of Christian Education.

Possibly had we been asked, which of the Roman Poets would present the greatest difficulty to a religious editor, we should have instanced Ovid. Virgil's purity of character would render the work of christianizing him comparatively easy, and in the midst of the Epicureanism of Horace there is an ever-recurring memento of the brevity of life, like the skeleton at the Egyptian festival, which cannot fail to touch a sympathetic chord in the human heart, and awaken solemn and wholesome thoughts. When in Terence Chærea pretends to justify his fault by the example of the divinity,

Ego humuncio hoc non facerem ?

it seems a sort of *reductio ad absurdum*, and kindles at once in our minds the idea of the miserable falsity and delusion of the pagan religion. But with Ovid the case appears to be different; for, even where his dark cosmogony runs parallel with Holy Writ, charmed with the beauties of his immortal verse, we sometimes find it difficult to carry along with us the thought of the vanity of the matter. Yet Ovid can be ill spared from the class room, for, although no poet is more deeply tainted with the inherent vices of heathenism, none has sweeter verses or more captivating narrations. At the close of an article we will not dwell on the pictorial embellishments of the book, though engravings have great power to awaken the attention both of young and old; nor on the varied learning the editor has displayed. These things are good, very good, but we have seen them in other editions and other writers, and had the book no weightier merit it would have drawn no commendations from us.

The editor, himself a poet, and exhibiting throughout a cultivated taste, keenly alive to poetic beauties, has thoroughly illustrated his author by parallel passages from other writers modern as well as ancient: indeed sweets are culled from the whole field of literature. This is a peculiarity and a very important one. We have never been able to understand why, while Homer and Virgil are so assiduously taught, little or no notice should be taken in the class-room of Milton and Shakspeare. But this is not the great peculiarity which gives the book its chief merit in our eyes. It is, that every thing is measured by the standard of Divine Truth, and that a strain

of unobtrusive piety, like a silver thread, runs through the whole commentary.

While the classic mythology is fully exhibited, and a better understanding, we are confident, of the ancient faith may be attained by a perusal of the introductions to the several fables, than from a laborious study of the whole pantheon, we have nowhere seen a line that could mantle the cheek of modesty herself. We have indeed observed a line where the *callida junctura* is not sufficiently observed, and the measure halts in consequence. We refer to line 34 of Jupiter in Dianæ Formam; and we mention it, not in the spirit of censoriousness, but that the editor in his next issue may make the very slight transposition which will set the metre on its feet again.

Superum petit æthera victor.

And while in the mood for finding fault we may as well call attention to a curious error in the note on *Immedicabile vulnus*, page 62, which reads as it now stands, an incurable wound is to be *inflicted* with the sword; a reading so entirely incongruous with the remainder of the paragraph that it is marvellous it should have escaped the proof-reader.

We have given this book high praise, and in our own justification we would gladly make large extracts from it, but our remarks have already run to greater length than we contemplated. We must content ourselves with a single passage and it shall be a brief one. One of the shortest of the passages we had marked for extraction will be found on page 52, and it may illustrate our meaning and exhibit the character of the commentary as well as longer portions. It is the note on *Fratrum gratia rara est*, in which the editor remarks: "How unnatural is the variance of the members of a common origin and a common heritage. How strongly are we reminded, by this sentence, that the first blood shed was that of a brother by a brother's hand.

Behold how good, and how pleasant it is, for brethren to dwell together in unity. Psalm cxxxiii. 1.

But when the earth was stained with wickedness,
And lust; and justice fled from every breast
Then brethren vilely shed each other's blood." CATULLUS.

We have then an Ovid which we can put into the hands of the youth of our schools with entire confidence, and we believe that its extensive use in our Academies and Classical schools would be of inestimable benefit; convinced as we are

that it is calculated, under the Divine blessing, to minister at once to the improvement of the intellect, the taste and the moral and religious sentiments.

But there are other authors to be read, and we would gladly see Virgil, and especially Horace, similarly edited, and if this matter can be presented to the Church of Christ in an aspect in any degree commensurate with the importance it wears to our own mind, the want will not be suffered to remain long unsupplied; and when our Classical books are all enlisted in the service of Religion, we may hope to find our school education in harmony with the true interests of the immortal beings who assemble in our class-rooms; and perhaps the Christian Teacher may less frequently feel that sickness of the heart which often oppresses him, when he measures the little he seems able to accomplish, with the heavy responsibility that rests upon him.

ARTICLE VI.

CHURCH-FEELING IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

By church-feeling is meant the attachment which we have for our own denominational christianity, her doctrines, usages, institutions and benevolent efforts. This feeling is natural. It grows out of the impressions and associations of childhood and youth, as well as the matured reflections and judgments of manhood. It is akin to the attachments of home and family, our native place and the land which we call our own. The man, who has no proper feeling for home and country, who does not love the scenes of his childhood, as far back as memory will carry him, the fountains and streams where he slaked his thirst and along whose banks he wandered, and the woods and mountain sides where he roamed unrestrained, inhaling the refreshing breeze, that man is deficient in one of the most important elements of character. He wants sensibility. He wants heart,—church-feeling is of the same character. It grows up with home scenes and associations, the catechism, the church-edifice, the music, and, above all, the soul-stirring truths uttered from the sacred desk which awakened conscience and gave a new direction to the character and life: and it is matured in the deliberate and hearty approbation of the doctrinal basis and symbols of the church. The want of this feeling betrays a deficiency much to be regretted.

For this feeling is virtuous. It is to the church what patriotism is to the country, and is the more noble in proportion to the necessities of the church; so that a man would scorn to leave his church because he was offered a more lucrative or influential position in another, or because there was not bestowed upon him the degree of attention and respect which, in his own judgment, his talents deserve.

This feeling stands opposed, 1st, to church adoration or the substitution of the church for Christ. An attachment of this character is idolatrous. We have no patience with men who can see no farther than their own church; who shut out the light of the sun in order that they may be illuminated by a wax taper, only so that it be a church taper; whose benevolence and love are all circumscribed by the limits of the church; who see neither beauty nor excellency in any other denomination; who acknowledge neither the ministry nor the ministerial acts of any other church, but, with a hardness of heart which is dreadful even in the conception, give all others over to the uncovenanted mercies of God. It is a subject of profound gratitude, that the uncovenanted mercies of God are infinitely above the tender mercies of these bigots.

This feeling stands opposed, secondly, to that maukish sentimentalism and pretended liberality, which would make no distinction in the churches of Christ and would have them one; which would hold world conventions and confound creeds and break down the distinctive doctrines which form so many hedges of the truth, that christian charity may have an unobstructed flow into the hearts of all. This would constitute the church in general, without discipline and without doctrine, to which, alas, too many already belong. These are the electicks, who see nothing to admire at home and every thing abroad; whose expansive liberality will lead them across the ocean to sit in solemn convention with Unitarians and Universalists, and give the right hand of fellowship to the deniers of the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures and the sanctification of the Sabbath, and, at home, make war to the knife against their own persecuted brethren, who flee from the ecclesiastical tyranny of their own land to find an asylum in ours. We admire the charity which, like that of the Savior and his Apostles, will lead to sufferings and death for the salvation of the world. It is heavenly and divine. But we would not forget that the Gospel must first be preached at Jerusalem and to the Jews, and then the Gentiles should be evangelized. God forbid that we should touch, with the softest down of our pen, to injure that charity which

risers in divine beauty and excellency far above the faith of miracles and the benevolence of complete self-consecration. We would condemn only its semblance, the earth-born, ambitious, erratic meteor, which shines here and there fitfully, and which would claim to be the sun which sheds its steady radiance over the whole earth to invigorate and fructify.

This feeling stands opposed, thirdly, to that narrow selfishness which confines its charity within the limits of the congregation. This may be appropriately called the congregational feeling. Sometimes it extends itself as far as State lines and, within this sphere, will operate favorably. But beyond this there is no church for them. Church extension, the institutions of the church whether literary, theological, or benevolent, what have they to do with them. This feeling may be strikingly illustrated by the benevolence of that wealthy church-member who would give largely to erect a steeple, build an organ, paint the exterior and fresco the interior of the church edifice in the most beautiful and costly manner, whilst the appeal of a church, too poor to sustain itself, in a neighboring county was met by a flat denial.

Now church-feeling is opposed to all these. It looks with interest upon all christian denominations, but with deeper interest and more intense affection upon its own. It does not worship the church, and with an exclusive bigotry, regard all others as abandoned to destruction, but it admires the stately and venerable edifice, erected in troublous times, amid the contentions of the Reformation and the persecutions of tyrants. It admires its scriptural doctrines and well constructed creeds, and, whilst it does not pronounce them faultless, finds less in them to condemn and more to admire than in others. It looks upon all parts of the church with interest, and, uninfluenced by State lines, sectional, synodical, or congregational feeling, it prays for the church, ministry, congregations, missionaries, literary, theological and benevolent institutions, and gives liberally wherever there is the greatest need. Thus, having begun at Jerusalem, it will extend its sympathy and aid to all other Christian denominations, in the spirit of the most enlarged liberality.

This feeling, I have said, is natural, and belongs to the nobler part of our nature. It is also useful, and to it may be traced much of the effective benevolence of the age. It has been operating, with great success, in other denominations. The secret of success of other denominations over us, in their church extension, is to be found in this feeling. Their attachment to their own church is so great that they are willing to

labor, to pray, and to make sacrifices for her; and, whilst extending the borders of their own church, they lose nothing of that exalted charity which seeks the welfare of the whole world. What is the reason that the Presbyterian, Congregational, Episcopalian, Methodist and Baptist denominations have extended themselves so rapidly in this country? Is it to be found in the purity of their doctrine and their exalted morality? Some of them are highly antagonistic in doctrine, and, in morals, perhaps but little difference is discernible. We suppose that the doctrines of the Lutheran church are more scriptural and consistent than those of any other branch of the Church of Christ. Yet our progress in church extension is not to be compared with the least favored of those mentioned. Are they more wealthy? By no means. Neither are they more intelligent, except, perhaps, the three former. Do they possess more piety, more of the Spirit of Christ? We cannot entertain the thought. There is, in proportion to our numbers, in this country, as much profound, humble, scriptural piety as you find in any of the churches of Christ. There is a great want of church-feeling, and this is the secret of their success and our deficiency. It is by no means unusual for our ministers to neglect the benevolent operations of our own church for the purpose of promoting some other charity. Large collections have been taken, and much interest felt in our churches for the cause of Tract and Missionary associations under the control of other ecclesiastical denominations, whilst no interest has been manifested in the extension of our own church, or the increase of her ministerial and ecclesiastical efficiency. No doubt other denominations are pleased to witness this liberality and praise it publicly, whilst in secret they laugh at our simplicity. The Episcopal church carried on the farce of calling the Lutheran, the German Episcopal, and the Episcopal, the English Lutheran church, until the charm has ceased, or they have become ashamed of it. Whatever the folly or the sin or both may have been, they have built up some noble christian churches out of the material which Lutheranism furnished. But we have wandered from our subject. We asserted that this feeling is useful. God has divided his church into families, for wise purposes. Affection burns most intensely and brings forth its richest fruits amongst those with whom we have daily intercourse, and whose sentiments and feelings harmonize with our own. This affection becomes feeble in proportion as it is widely extended and as it reaches those less congenial. Precisely thus is it with church-feeling. The different denominations exist that their affections may burn most

intensely and efficiently within the sphere in which God has placed them. When a church becomes over-grown, it must break up into fragments, that it may retain its activity and aggressive power. The history of the church in this country sufficiently illustrates this point.

Now church-feeling calls into exercise and develops the resources of the church for the glory of God and the good of man. Why have I been born and baptized and reared in the Lutheran church? That I should become a Methodist, or Baptist, or Episcopalian? By no means, else I would have been born and reared in one or the other of those communions. Surely the Providence of God placed me where I am, and his Grace is displayed in the communion in which I have been born as powerfully as in any other; for wheresoever His Gospel is preached in its purity, there are witnessed the trophies of his redeeming grace. My being born in the Lutheran church is not a matter of chance. There must be some reason for it. It is, that in it, under the instructions of the Gospel there proclaimed, under its discipline and church government I may glorify God in my body and spirit which are his. I am placed in this church, that I may promote its highest welfare, elevate its piety, intelligence, charity, and zeal. God has placed me here, that I may aid with all my powers to develop its resources, and make the church aggressive, not on our christian brethren, but on the world, that the world may be brought in willing subjection to the Prince of Peace. I trust that the time has gone by, when one Christian church will feel, that, in her aggressive movements, every other may be lawful plunder. — Thus we can see wisdom and goodness in that arrangement by which the church is distributed into denominations holding the same faith, baptism and Lord and Master, warring against the same common enemy, and looking for the same eternal rest and the same crown of righteousness in the world of glory. I will not presume to say, that there may not be powerful reasons to induce a change in the ecclesiastical relations of a minister or layman. I confess that, whilst I can see reasons to induce ministers from other denominations to desire to enter into our church, I can see none sufficiently powerful to induce a man, who desires to be eminently useful, to leave it. Such are the necessities of our church, in all its branches, that a devotedly pious man could hardly be induced to leave it for any reason whatever. It is true that all men do not view objects from the same standpoint and through the same medium, but to us, who live within the sound of the piteous voices which proceed from souls

earnestly praying for spiritual instruction, and who behold the tens of thousands who are wandering as sheep without a shepherd, there is no field of labor, in this country, more necessitous and more promising in abundant harvests.

The great advantage of this church-feeling is, to unite and concentrate the energies of a single denomination, and give it a direction where it will tell to the greatest advantage for the interests of Christ's Kingdom. All men cannot think alike, on all subjects. Every denomination is persuaded of the conformity of its creed with the doctrines of the Bible. It is duty, therefore, to disseminate these doctrines, and, under this peculiar aspect of divine truth, to contend with the great adversary of souls. Under no other can we contend with the same freedom or efficiency; with none are we so well acquainted; under any other standard, we proceed to the battle as did David with the armor of Saul. He could use the sling and the smooth stones of the brook more efficiently than the sword and the spear of the heavy armed soldier. Besides, this church-feeling seems to be necessary for the purity as well as the efficiency of the church. Love for the church will lead its ministers and members to watch carefully over the purity of her doctrines, inasmuch as her power and respectability will depend, in a large measure, upon the conformity of her teachings with her standards. It will lead to an anxious desire to promote her spirituality, intelligence, and, in one word, every thing which will promote her intellectual and moral power.

It follows from all this, that church-feeling leads to the desire and prayer for pure, profound and heart-searching revivals of religion. It puts forth constant and well-directed efforts for the increased number and efficiency of the ministry, for the distribution of books both doctrinal and practical, especially the Bible and well-selected tracts and biographies. It labors for the spread of the Gospel at home and abroad by means of foreign and domestic missions. In a word it is the spirit of Jesus manifesting itself in the form of Lutheranism, Presbyterianism or any other aspect of divine truth, and thus wielding the power which it possesses for the glory of God and the good of man. Now it will be manifest to every unprejudiced mind, that this feeling is by no means sectarian in its character, and is perfectly consistent with this oneness of the body of Christ. That church, which boasts that it is always and every where the same, is not as closely or as cordially united in its parts as are the different denominations of evangelical Protestant Christians, in the spirit and oneness with which they seek the glory of God and the happiness of man.

Now, I assert that this church-feeling is wanting in many sections of our church and among not a few of our ministers and congregations. This condition may be explained, in part, by the proximity of an overwhelming influence of another denomination more learned and respected, and partly, by neglected or a one-sided, improperly directed education. It is too true, that some portions of our church have little or no sympathy with it. They are unacquainted with her doctrines, and do not preach them; they have introduced the forms and ceremonies of other churches instead of their own; they encourage the schools and colleges of other denominations, rather than those of their own, and although they may belong to the General Synod of the church, their connection with the church is regarded rather as a matter of accident or convenience, than an expression and earnest of their devotion to its highest welfare. Whilst this state of things does undeniably exist, we have no disposition to find fault or to censure, we would rather endeavor, by argument and persuasion, to produce a different state of things, assured that the Lutheran church possesses, in her doctrines, church government and discipline, the elements of the highest degree of efficiency, and that the only things needed to call out that efficiency, is a proper degree of church-feeling.

The question then presents itself, by what means can we excite this feeling for the church? I reply, *by education*. 1st, *Family*. 2d, *Congregational*. 3d, *Academical*. 4th, *Theological*. We have arranged these topics in the order of time, rather than that of logical connection.

1. *The family*. It has been correctly asserted, that the family is the nursery of the state, and that a community of well-regulated families must necessarily be a well-regulated community. The family is the nursery of patriotism, justice, high honor, politeness, morality and piety. Home impressions are necessarily the most powerful and permanent, because they are made under influences most favorable to produce them, viz.: Parental authority, filial affection and subjection, with the constant pressure of precept and example. The teachers of youth have a lively perception of this, in their efforts to eradicate vicious, and to create virtuous habits in their pupils. With equal truth may it be said, that the family is the nursery of church-feeling. The question is not unfrequently asked, why such and such denominations are so much attached to their church. You never hear them condemn their ministry, or institutions, and they never wander from their church, to receive religious instruction elsewhere. The

answer to the question is to be found in the education of the family. They are taught the doctrines of the church out of the catechism, they are conducted to the house of God whenever opened for religious instruction, they are taught to venerate her ministry, her institutions and her history, and thus, they grow up, both with a profound attachment to their own denomination and the Church of Christ in general. A truly Christian management of the household will lay the foundation for this feeling. The morning and evening service, the song of praise, the religious instruction of the family, especially on the Lord's day, all contribute powerfully to secure the desired end. It is true, the influence of the services of the sanctuary is very defective in many families, because they are instructed so seldom by a minister of their own denomination; perhaps once in three, four or six weeks. This will exert a chilling influence even upon well-directed family efforts.—When these latter do not exist and the family attends the ministerial instructions of other denominations, or none at all, during the intervals of the preaching of their own minister, it is not to be wondered at, that the people have no proper church-feeling. The only remedy is, increased efforts in the family and the multiplication of the ministry. Need I say then, that it is the duty of parents not only to train their children to intelligence, industry and virtue, to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, but to educate them in the doctrines of the church, by means of the catechism which should form a constantly recurring Sabbath exercise. They should take their children with them to the house of God, and teach them there by example to be devout, attentive and prayerful. They should introduce into the family the literature of the church, and in their benefactions, they should give the preference to the benevolent societies of the church. Thus, training the children from infancy to love the church and labor for her welfare, there would be formed a union of feeling and effort which in its results would be most happy.

2. *The congregation.* Passing by many considerations which suggest themselves in this connection, I proceed to consider congregational education, as a means of correcting the evil under discussion. The pastor of the congregation is ordinarily the most influential person in it. He ought to be the most intelligent and pious. His comfort and success will depend much upon these qualifications. His example and his instructions from the sacred desk give tone and character, on almost all subjects, to the people among whom he labors. He

possesses, therefore, the power of awakening and directing the feeling, whose importance we are endeavoring to illustrate. He can, if he will, call into exercise a sectarian or a congregational feeling. He can lead his people to neglect the highest interest of the church, with which he stands in ecclesiastical connection, and direct their contributions into another channel. He can neglect the catechetical instruction of the children, teach doctrines at variance with the standards of the church, and thus unlutheranize the congregation in doctrine and ceremony, as far as his influence extends. But, what is his duty in this respect? Why is he a minister in the church, if it be not to promote the glory of God by means of the doctrines, ceremonies and institutions of the church? Unquestionably it is his duty to promote the highest welfare of the church in every honest way. He is bound to teach the doctrines of the church which, by his position, he has declared to be more consonant with the word of God than those of any other church. He ought, in a proper manner, and at a suitable time, to point out what is distinctive in those doctrines, so that his hearers may understand their doctrinal position and church relations. The much neglected, but ancient and highly useful practice of catechizing the young should be diligently pursued, not for the purpose of receiving them into the church by confirmation after a particular course of instruction, but in order to indoctrinate them in Christian truth, so that they may be led to repentance and salvation. If possible, congregational schools should be established under the supervision of the church-council, and instructed by godly teachers. The literary, theological and benevolent institutions of the church should be the subjects of prayer and precept and effort before the congregation. Statedly and frequently should facts and arguments be presented to the people on these subjects, and their duty be pointed out and enforced. More than this as ministers of the Gospel of Christ, we should so conduct ourselves in the church and before the world, so should we preach and lecture and visit from house to house, that God may be glorified, and the church be honored through our instrumentality. Thus will the congregation be edified and that attachment to the church be formed which is necessary to her highest usefulness.

3. *The Academy.* Under the term Academy, we include the academy in its ordinary sense and the college. Here the education, commenced in the congregation, may be carried forward under influences equally favorable to the promotion of church-feeling. The time was, and it is not distant, when

there were neither colleges nor preparatory schools under the influence of the church. Our young men who desired a liberal education, were compelled to resort to the literary institutions of other denominations, and there they formed attachments to other churches, and were led to undervalue and despise their own. This will answer the query, why so many of the intelligent young men of our church seek other ecclesiastical connections and even leave our ministry for that of sister churches. The same facts, though not so numerous and striking, are true of the other sex, for whose instruction, alas! no provision, thus far, has been made by the church. The funds of the wealthy could not be more productively invested for the church than in the endowment of a first rate female school, in some central position in Pennsylvania. The difficulty in the way of the education of our young men is now obviated, so far as the existence of colleges can remove it. It is natural and reasonable to expect, that ministers and people of the church will patronize their own institutions. Here they are placed at once under church influences; and if there is any power in associations and friendships in the same church connections—if there is any value in the doctrines and usages of the church, they have them here. I can see no reason why the young men of the church should not be educated in the institutions of the church. Shall we neglect our own and sustain those of other denominations? Shall we build up others at the expense of our own? I trust no such sentiments will animate any considerable number of our people. But it may be alleged, that other literary institutions are superior to ours, and that our young men should enjoy the highest literary advantages. Without entering into an argument on this subject, we will admit, for the present, that there are literary institutions superior to ours. What conclusion should we arrive at from this startling admission? That we should elevate the character and efficiency of our institutions, as we value the reputation of the church, and as we hope to retain in it and to develop the talent and resources which she possesses. In what way can our Institutions be elevated in character, and become permanent in influence? As far as we can see, only by the concentrated coöperation and support of the ministers and members of the church. Do you suppose that other denominations care for us or our institutions? Only so far as general benevolence and christian charity lead them to desire the success of every useful enterprise. They have their own institutions to sustain, and, they understand too well their commanding influence to undervalue them, by withholding pa-

trouge to bestow it on others. Who will condemn them? I will not. Their language to us is, "go forward and develope your own resources with the means which you possess, and you will not fail of success." We unite with them in the sentiment, and, whilst we would not reject either their students or their money, we would feel ashamed to ask them for one or the other. The church in Pennsylvania alone has the ability to sustain Pennsylvania College, far more than the Methodist or Presbyterian churches have to sustain their colleges. Whatever the character of this institution may be, and it is not without a good name, the church in Pennsylvania has the ability to elevate it to a position of excellency unsurpassed by any literary institution in the land. Why has she not done it? Why not increase her library, her philosophical apparatus, her instructors, her pupils and her funds, until nothing more could be desired in the way of excellency, The writer asserts, and he does it advisedly, that if this were accomplished, more would be effected for the permanent reputation and influence of the church, than by any other agency with which he is acquainted. The same may be said of the other literary institutions of the church, in their respective locations. To secure this desirable end, one would naturally look for coöperation to the intelligent and influential in the church, to the ministers and their people, who value education and understand the importance of elevated literary institutions to the highest welfare of the church.

Very appropriate and useful would it be for the ministers of the Gospel to preach statedly on the general subject of education, and its influence on the church and the civil institutions of the land, and direct attention to the importance of our own institutions. Thus, by our united efforts, we would secure an amount of influence and importance for the church which will be sought for in vain in any other direction.

4. *The Theological Seminary.* As a centre of influence for the church, in almost every aspect of the subject, perhaps the Theological Seminary occupies the first place. It is the greatest wheel in the theological machinery of the church. It operates not only once or twice and then ceases, but is constantly at work, both directly and indirectly, moulding and fashioning the theological sentiment of the ministers, and through them, of the people. This influence is strikingly exemplified in a sister church, which has wheeled about during the last ten years, and is now firing large and small guns to sustain a doctrine which it formerly condemned. The Theological Seminary, in order to develope and perpetuate a proper

church feeling, should teach the doctrines of the church as contained in her symbols. If others are substituted, which may be regarded as eclectic in their nature, or the doctrines of other churches, or subversive of our symbols and opposed to them, then it follows necessarily that the Seminary becomes the greatest enemy of the church, which it professes to uphold. The doctrines of a few individuals, and not the doctrines of the church, are taught. The character of the church insensibly undergoes a change, and after the lapse of some years, it will be found that she has completely shifted her ground. Thus a designing man, who occupies a place of influence in the Theological Seminary, and is ambitious to become distinguished, has it in his power, unless the Directors are intelligent and vigilant, to produce a revolution in the church which may never be suppressed. The only remedy in such a case, is a return to the standards of the church which are fixed and immovable. It is in the Seminary where the doctrines of the church are exhibited in their logical connection and symmetrical proportion, where they are supported from Scripture reason and history, and where her form of government and ceremonial services are presented in their proper connection, that the loveliness of the church appears. Here, if any where, then, ought to be church-feeling: here, where the beauty and strength and excellency of the church are seen, as from an eminence, if any where, there must be enthusiasm in her behalf.

Church-feeling in the Seminary will be greatly promoted by the intelligence and piety, not only of the Professors, but by that of the young men who congregate in the halls of theology. They act and react on each other. The piety and intelligence of one stimulate the piety and intelligence of others. Christian affection and loveliness are thus cultivated. The ministers of the church thus have confidence in each other and the communion of their choice. They labor in the vineyard of the Lord from love to God and love to the church. These feelings they carry with them and develope in their congregations, and thus the church becomes more united and harmonious in doctrine, feeling and action.

Y. S. R.

ARTICLE VII.

THE SYMBOLS.

By Rev. J. N. Hoffman, Pastor of the Evang. Luth. Church, Carlisle, Pa.

THE question respecting the Symbols of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, a feature of which has been recently discussed by several writers, is not one of recent origin. Even independent of the historical developments and profound investigations of the "mother country" on this subject, its vital importance has engaged the attention of Lutheran ministers in this country for many years. And this interest in the subject has received a new impetus, by all the late historical results in the Church in Germany; which, without controversy, have demonstrated the sad effects of a lax system of doctrine, and consequently tended to lead the most pious and talented ministers to change their position, and to advocate the necessity of a strenuous adherence to the symbols of the church. This fact I will hereafter demonstrate. In the mean time, it was distinctly perceived, and readily admitted, by Lutheran ministers in this country, that a subject so intimately blended with the whole past history of the Church, with her very life and existence, would imperiously demand a prospective investigation. In this manner, the flames had been slumbering in their smothered concealment for many years, and only needed a proper occasion to cause them to burst forth with resistless power. For a season, the influence of name, age, station, learning &c. might restrain the ardent longings of the immortal mind; but by this very self imposed restraint, the inextinguishable energies of the soul gathered firmness and vigor, until, aided by experience, learning and other agencies, it obtained sufficient confidence in itself, no longer to be enslaved by the dictates and authority of others, but to come forth in the publication and defence of the truth. Such a period has arrived. And hence, instead of seeking the occasion of the recent discussion, in any separate event of late years, we must go farther and examine the deep causes which long since have operated to produce these results. We will recognize the origin in prior developments; and especially in the pressing wants of the soul; and, consequently, in the irresistible tendency of the human mind, dissatisfied with the empty husks of a subjective spiritualism, and longing for the more "substantial" food of objective power and life.

It appears to me, that those who object to the authority of the "Symbols," have not considered the consequences to which their opposition must lead. These consequences, though scarcely recognized at the moment, will develop themselves in all their ruinous effect, when too late to apply a remedy. Will not the attempt to render our Confession unpopular, weaken the attachment of our members to the church? By suggesting a doubt in respect to the truth of any of its doctrines, or by exciting opposition to its binding authority, the result will not be limited to this document, or the doctrines contained therein, but extend themselves to the whole Church. And whilst we are thus alienating the minds of our people, and destroying their confidence in their "Symbols," other denominations, pursuing a wiser policy, run away with our best members; and whilst they openly applaud our supposed liberality, they secretly laugh at our weakness.

In the discussion of this subject we meet the old, oft-repeated and popular sentiment: "The Bible — the Bible alone is all-sufficient!" We cannot conceal our surprise, that men, who profess to be acquainted with the past history, and the present state of the Church, should repeat this idea, in its popular signification, in opposition to the Confessions of the Church. Have they forgotten, that in all ages, the most erratic heretics, appealed to the Bible in the same way? Are they ignorant of the fact, that all the petty sects of the present day, appeal to the Bible as the source of their errors; that one of the most recent prophets claims for the "Church of God," established by himself, the Bible as its sole foundation, the correct interpretation of which was reserved for him? This principle, however correct in itself, is calculated to mislead and divide. And is the Church, together with her progressive history, so entirely separated from Christ, that in the ages of her development, there should be no practical result, worth our attention? Is the Church no longer under the guidance and control of her glorious head? Has He not fulfilled his promises in her living history? If He has; if he is still directing and sustaining her; if, for eighteen hundred years, his Spirit has animated, guided and enlightened her, and thus led her forward in the development of her power, her knowledge and her experience, then we ask, has the Spirit of God, dwelling in the Church, produced no results during all this time, meriting the attention of christians? Has he lived and operated in her all this time without producing any development, any knowledge, any experience? Is her amount of suffering; her advancing culture; her ardent prayers; her various experience

and manifold productions—is all this of no moment to us? Would it be wise, in an aged, experienced christian, to disregard all the results of his labors, prayers and experience, all the leadings of Providence, the teachings derived from the example of others, with all the advantages flowing from a long life of christian zeal;—would it be wise to reject all this, and to go back to the imbecility of inexperienced youth? Truth is immutable, invariable, eternal. The Bible cannot be improved. But has the experience and learning of the Church, afforded no additional light in the interpretation of the truth? Have not results been produced, in correcting the religious views of mankind, and in bringing the truth into a regular well-defined system, which may be regarded as fixed and irrefutable? Nay! since I have begun to ask questions,—would the opposers of Creeds, themselves have a church, in which they could stand, and from which they could derive a support, but for the existence and influence of these very Creeds? And does it not seem ungrateful, after an individual is taken up into any organized association whatever, for the purpose of sharing the benefits connected therewith, if whilst he is realizing those benefits, he labors to injure the organization, by a public opposition to its laws? He was made acquainted with the laws before he entered it; and if he disagreed with them, he ought not to have concealed the fact, or attempted to become a member.

The question respecting the correctness of the doctrines of the A. C., is entirely distinct from the present enquiry concerning its authority in the Church. Nor can the former, in any manner, aid in deciding the latter. If the correctness or incorrectness of its doctrines is to decide, the argument may be employed on both sides of the question, and the advantage would evidently preponderate in favor of those who advocate its binding authority. For, whilst its opposers acknowledge that a *majority* of its doctrines are correct, and only a *few* incorrect, it is also found that the opposers themselves are in the *minority*; and that the Church at large, during three centuries, has received the *whole* as true. Thus in receiving the A. C. in its normal authority, we are not only sustained by the Church, as such, and consequently by a large majority in all ages, but even by the acknowledgments of its opposers, that most of its doctrines are true. If this, therefore, is to be an argument at all, it certainly opposes those who reject the authority of the A. C.

Nor can the peculiar form, in which the question has hitherto been discussed, bring us to any satisfactory result. The

question, whether the Lutheran Church in this country has ever acknowledged the binding authority of the A. C., involves many other points, which must first be settled, before the original question can be determined. We would have to enquire, by whom such an acknowledgment is to be made? What person or persons possess sufficient authority to render such an act permanent and obligatory? Are individuals, or congregations, or Synods, or the General Synod, or all of them together, required to unite in some final expression of opinion on the subject? If so, would any such acknowledgment, made even under the most favorable circumstances, be received as valid and final; and would the succeeding generation receive it as such? These and other matters would have first to be decided, the moment we deny the original authority of the A. C., and it is easy to foresee the confusion, strife and ruin that would ensue from such a course.

Thus it will be perceived that the foregoing procedure cannot bring us to a definite conclusion on the subject. The matter must be (as it already has been) settled in a more authoritative and substantial manner. We are happily not destitute of such a decision. The ultimate arrangement is no longer in our hands. It has been finally settled *by the authoritative action of the LUTHERAN CHURCH*, anterior to, and irrespective of the establishment or even existence of our Church in this country. And it cannot be controverted, *that under such a presupposition, the Lutheran Church was founded in America.* That policy, therefore, must be doubtful, if not pernicious, which would unsettle and disturb, what has long since been determined, not by the arbitrary and ever-varying opinions of individuals, but by the Scriptures and the Providence of God, through the medium of the practical life and progressive development of the Church of Christ. The *divinely-human* result, of the indwelling of the Spirit in the Church, is embodied in the *Augustan Confession*. This is the authorized charter of her rights—the product of her historical life. The very existence of a Lutheran Church in this country, is a proof and illustration of such a previous arrangement. If such a document as the A. C. did not exist, who would have ever heard of such a Church? To oppose this sacred instrument, or to strive to diminish the confidence of our members respecting it, is certainly a fearful and responsible task.

But no feature connected with the general question, appears to me to be more loose and untenable than the so-called “po-

sition of the General Synod." I will in charity suppose that its advocates have never examined the consequences to which it essentially leads. To receive the A. C. "as substantially correct," involves an absolute absurdity—as will be seen hereafter. Better far, that the whole should be rejected, as among the exploded dogmas of a scholastic age, and buried among the rubbish of the "dark ages," than to adopt a position involving so much inconsistency, and leading to consequences so serious. The following *three* aspects of said position will illustrate the foregoing remarks.

First. What doctrines of the A. C. are, or are not "substantially correct?" Has this ever been determined? If not, then we might be at some loss which to receive and which to reject; and, I greatly fear, there might be some diversity of opinion. If it has not been determined, who is to decide; what authority is to designate the true, and point out the false? Has any power been delegated to any individual or association possessing *admitted* authority to decide the question? If not, then we ask, which are the fundamental, and which the non-fundamental articles? Here is a difficulty. Either must the matter be determined by an acknowledged, authoritative tribunal, or that decision must be left to the subjective and arbitrary judgment of separate individuals; one or the other. "Entweder, oder"—there is no escaping the alternative. Is it replied, that those should be received which agree with Scripture? But this only shifts the question without answering it. For, who is to judge which agree, or do not agree with Scripture? As there might be differences of sentiment here also, we are as much at a loss as ever. Thus, it will be seen, what difficulties must ensue, by rejecting any part of the A. C. before a definite rule is furnished equally authoritative and symbolic, to decide all controverted points. Nor is this all:—

Secondly. Do you say, in reply to the foregoing queries, that the doctrines of our Creeds, which are erroneous, are those respecting the Lord's Supper, Private (*not* "auricular") Confession, Baptismal regeneration &c.? You say that these should be rejected. Beware! Have you considered the principle involved in all this? Have you not perceived, that you are thus maintaining the very principle you condemn in others? You censure the advocates of the A. C. for wishing to subject the human mind, and to bind the conscience to human authority, instead of making the S. S. the only rule of faith. You object to this; and, what do you propose as a substitute?—*your own separate, individual opinion!* You reject the authority of the A. C.; and what do you put in its place?—

your own arbitrary judgment! You wish a rule; but that rule is not to be the well-trying, long-established, acknowledged standard of the Church, but your private, subjective opinions. How then can you object to Church-authority, and oppose those who advocate it, when you are adopting the very same principle, only in a more arbitrary manner? Are you not in this very manner usurping an authority over the consciences of men? Are you not substituting private authority in lieu of the authority of the Church? How then can you consistently charge others with designing to bind the conscience to the "exploded!" doctrines of the sixteenth century, when you are but carrying out the same principle, though without the same authority and security? Is it wise to abandon the authority of the Church, for the authority of an individual; or, to reject the established doctrines of the former, for the fancies of the latter? On which foundation are we likely to be most secure? The one is long established, tried, irrefutable and immutable: the other even independent of its individual, and therefore less permanent character, cannot last longer, than the lifetime of the individual. Is then the Church to adopt your opinions, while you live; only to change them when your successor chooses to preach a different doctrine? This would really be usurping authority with a vengeance. And would it not be highly honorable for a whole Church, to have no settled doctrines, but to be at the mercy of every one who might assume the authority of being a leader in Israel?

Besides, in pointing out the doctrines which you suppose should be rejected, will you find no opposition? Will they be satisfied with your selection? If you make your selection the guide for others, and require them to put your construction upon the A. C., would they not have greater reasons for objecting to your principles, than you have to object to the A. C.? The only alternative then that remains is this: either you must make your private decision the authoritative rule—by which you usurp dominion over human conscience—or, you must give the others the same latitude and liberty, in reference to the doctrines of the A. C., which you claim for yourself. The fallacy of the former I have already demonstrated; the sad results of the latter I shall now exhibit.

Thirdly. Do you deny that your opinions are to decide, but that each one has the right to decide for himself? You say that you receive the A. C. as "substantially correct," and you give the same right to all others. Now, as the broad and convenient phrase, "substantially correct," is not strictly defined; as it is not determined what part of the Creed falls into

this category and what part is excluded, it must be left optional with each individual, to apply it as he pleases. This you are bound to do, according to your own principle. You chose to reject the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, Confession &c.—but others, adopting your own principle, but differing in sentiment, may contend that the specified doctrines are correct, and in their place may reject others. According to this convenient scheme, you have no right to dictate to them, or prevent them from rejecting any other doctrine of the A. C. You choose to select the above mentioned doctrines; another may receive them as true, but reject the divinity of Christ, the plenary inspiration of the S. S. &c. How will you prevent this? You do not desire to bind their consciences. You will not receive the A. C. in its full extent. Therefore the doctrines you reject, cannot be a rule for others. They, having the same right with yourself, may select their doctrines as well as you, and if they choose to believe what you reject, and to reject what you believe, you have no power to prevent them. In this manner, different persons, under the vulcan shield of this *substantial* scheme, may reject any of the doctrines of the Confession. This is another result of a principle which must in the end prove destructive.

Do you reply that the doctrines you reject are not essential or fundamental, but that the others are. This, however, instead of settling the difficulty, actually increases it. For now we have two points to settle instead of one. On the one hand, some may regard the doctrines fundamental, which you reject. And this is actually the case. There are many excellent and learned divines, who regard especially the doctrine of the Sacrament, as contained in the Confession, as fundamental. And, remember, according to your own principle, you cannot dispute the point with them. On the other hand, there are those who deny those doctrines which you receive (at least some of them) to be essential. How will you escape these issues? How will you decide them? If you deny that the authority of the A. C. reaches the case, you will acknowledge that your own private judgment is still less available. In short, "the stand-point of the General Synod," on this subject, is a complete and ridiculous nullity.

Under these circumstances, what must be the tendency of the position which I have described? The silent but certain operations of a system so loose and uncertain, will display themselves when the evil is beyond all remedy. I shall not contribute, by any influence I may possess, to an issue that will undermine the foundations of our beloved Zion!

All those arguments against the symbolic authority of the A. C., drawn from the supposed duties, privileges and liberties of separate members or congregations, will be found more specious than solid. The presumed rights of individuals to change or modify articles of faith, are contingent and depend upon a variety of circumstances, some of which are decisive and final. The correct conception of the nature of the Church affords an additional illustration in support of the binding authority of the Augsburg Confession.

ARTICLE VIII.

EFFECT OF THE ADOPTION OF THE FORMULA OF CONCORD UPON THE LUTH. CHURCH AND LUTHERAN THEOLOGY.*

Translated from the German of Dr. G. J. Plank, of Goettingen, by Rev. Benjamin Sadtler,
A. M., Shippensburg, Pa.

THE very name of the Formula of Concord proclaimed the design of restoring that harmony of sentiment among the Lutheran theologians, which had been disturbed by a series of contentions, that had broken out among them after Luther's death. If possible it was even to secure harmony for the future. It was to present an instrument of peace having for its design, not only the settlement of all previously existing controversies, but likewise the removal of all occasion and material for others in future. As far as human foresight and measures could secure that object, in addition to a uniformity in her faith and practice, the internal peace of the Lutheran Church was to be guaranteed for all coming time. But how could any one, who even admitted the absolute attainability of this object, deem it possible, in view of the manner in which the composition of the Formula was undertaken, that its design could be accomplished. Yea, that as much as its primary design could be met by it, and even a temporary peace be secured among the theologians.¹

Harmony was to be attained by a majority of the theologians

* This article is extracted from the "History of Protestant Theology from the adoption of the Formula of Concord to the middle of the eighteenth century." By G. J. Plank, D. D. Goettingen, 1831.

¹ Vid. History of the origin and composition of the Formula of Concord in my history of Protestant Theology from Luther's death to the introduction of the Formula of Concord. Bk. ix. x. vol. iii. pp. 269-690.

uniting in the rejection and condemnation of certain doctrines and opinions that had been declared inconsistent with the pure and genuine Lutheran system. This majority was actually secured; but, in part, by means that operated in a very uncertain manner; those means were actual compulsion. But even if they had proceeded in a perfectly upright and open manner, and consequently could cherish the hope that this majority of the theologians would always remain united; even then there remained a highly important minority in opposition to it, whose accession would now become much more doubtful than before. Thus, in the plan of the originators of this harmonizing process, one feature was the forcible suppression of this minority in case it should come to the worst. This minority consisted principally of those theologians, whose opinions had been condemned in the Formula, and who had thereby been published as apostates to the pure Lutheran doctrine. Its very publication declared that they ought to be excluded from communion with the Lutheran Church, or rather this excision was actually embraced in it. It was hoped that this fact would operate powerfully enough to frighten them into an adhesion; or if it should not operate thus, it could, at least in the case of particular individuals, be made to receive its proper significance from those of their princes, who had taken an active part in this harmonizing work. Experience soon taught, in a very disagreeable manner, that this hope was by far too extravagant, and occasion was even given for the fear, that through it, the whole Lutheran Church might have been brought into a very critical condition.

It is true, that little was to be apprehended from several of those dissenting parties, with whom controversies had hitherto been maintained, and whose opinions had been condemned in the Formula. This resulted, partly from the fact that their originators or champions had died in the interim, and with them the adherents and proselytes which they had gained in various places; and partly, because they had withdrawn themselves into obscurity, and had thus been lost to observation. This event could the more readily occur, as, excepting in some particular limited spheres, and these but for a time, they had never been very numerous.

In this way we may probably account for the disappearance of the Osiandrists and Stankarists, together with the followers of the Antinomian Agricola and the Flacian Substancists, who had embraced the nonsensical opinion of their oracle Flacius, that hereditary depravity was the substance of man. In the ardor of that zeal, into which they had wrought them-

selves in their controversies, and which had not yet quite abated, or perhaps to justify that zeal of which they began to be ashamed, a separate article was devoted to each of these parties, in which their errors were forever proscribed in the Lutheran Church. In reality these errors never had found entrance into the Church; they had only gained a temporary importance from the senseless virulence with which they had been attacked and defended, and from the commotions which, in consequence, had been raised in several places. There always was an overwhelming majority of the theologians against them; there was therefore no reason to dread the opposition or the protests which their adherents might offer to the sentence of condemnation which was now pronounced against them, in the name of the whole Lutheran Church. The same might be said of the adherents and friends of that good fanatic Schwenkfeld, who had likewise received their sentence from the same source—a sentence which, for various reasons was as wise as just. They had already left the Lutheran Church of their own accord, and would certainly never have returned to her fold, even if they had not been condemned. On the other hand the peculiarities by which they were distinguished, forbade the idea that they could proselyte to any important extent.

In reality, therefore, it was not necessary to take such particular notice of the points in which these persons had diverged from the truth, in that new act whereby genuine Lutheran orthodoxy was to be fixed for all coming time, by a solemn declaration on the part of the whole church. By all the divisions which were opposed to the Flacian error in relation to human depravity, to the novel language of Osiander on the subject of justification, to the useless antitheses in which the Antinomians had presented the Law and Gospel, and to the vagaries of Schwenkfeld, nothing important was gained. It never had been at all doubtful, at least to the overwhelming majority of the Lutheran theologians, what was pure Lutheran doctrine on these subjects. Long before the appearance of the Formula they had pronounced upon them. The very fact of the general opposition which had been arrayed against these opinions, proclaimed in the most unequivocal manner that they were not regarded as Lutheran. Hence the composers of the new Formula only reiterated the judgment, which had been generally and decisively uttered against them long before, and, in opposing their decision to the opinions of those sectaries, there was not even a single new modification made in the form of presenting these doctrines.

The most that can be claimed is, that the theological usus loquendi in reference to these points, was more narrowly guarded and more accurately determined; but as far as the attainment of the object more immediately sought after was concerned, their labor was in vain.

On the other hand, there were two other points, that were regarded in a different manner, and to which the authors of the Formula ascribed greater importance. It may even be confidently maintained, that it was for their sake the whole of this work of concord was more immediately undertaken and consummated. During the life-time of Luther, it was somewhat doubtful, in reference to these two points, what should or could be regarded as the teaching of the Protestant Church. After his death, the controversies, to which they gave rise, made the matter but the more doubtful. It has become a question whether, on the doctrines of hereditary depravity, freewill and grace, the first more rigid dogmatic form which Luther had adopted in his earlier writings, or the milder form into which Melancthon subsequently moulded them, was to be received as the authorized teaching of the Protestant party. What was yet more questionable, was whether all of the distinctions which Luther had once adopted as the exhibitions of his own individual faith, in relation to the Lord's Supper and the person of Christ, were likewise to be regarded as essential parts of the general creed of the Protestant Church. This had not only become debatable; but there were very strong reasons for the uncertainty. Through the influence and respectability of its authors it was positively determined in the new Formula, that, in reference to both these points, they would and should adhere to the unaltered views which Luther had presented. By this means the creed of the church received a fixedness, in which it had previously been deficient. In so far, therefore, something new was added to the theology of Protestantism, for it could be regarded as something new, that what previously had been left undecided now became fixed. Yet, from this very fact originated all those disastrous and distracting consequences, not only to our theology, but likewise to our church, in her outer and inner relations.

In reference to the first question, which related to the proper dogmatic form of the articles on original depravity, freewill and grace, it was really uncertain whether the decision of the Formula was not actually against the majority of Protestant theologians. The milder theory on these subjects, which Melancthon had already maintained in the second principal edition of his *Loci*, had unquestionably been received by the

majority of them, even during the lifetime of Luther. Perhaps but few were conscious, that, in doing so, they had departed from the genuine Lutheran view; at least all of them could not distinctly show where the one diverged from the other. But even those, who, with a perfect and clear understanding of the facts in the case, acknowledged to themselves the variation of the view of Melanchthon from that of Luther, found justification for their course in Luther himself. Luther could not but know, and did know it right well, that Melanchthon had mollified his hard Augustinism in these doctrines; for he had done it with the most unreserved openness, and at times and under circumstances that could not fail to make the modification more striking and, consequently, to give it the greater publicity. Luther perseveringly retained his own language, in reference to these tenets, and, upon more than one occasion, plainly intimated that he had not abandoned his own views; yet he never publicly opposed the new view of Melanchthon; he never betrayed any sensitiveness on the subject, nor did he express his disapprobation because Melanchthon had ventured to diverge from his own dogmatic form. Certainly from all of this the other theologians of the party could justly draw the conclusion, that Luther did not desire to prevent any of them from adopting Melanchthon's view. They were justified in believing, that he did not view the difference in the opinions as being of such moment as to wish to bind their convictions to his own. They were justified in believing, that in pursuing the course they did, they were not rendering themselves guilty of any departure from the fundamental idea of the doctrine. Added to this, it was known that all of Luther's colleagues at Wittenberg, even during his lifetime, had adopted the milder theory of Melanchthon; when the fact is considered that certainly the greater part of the Protestant theologians had been educated in the Wittenberg schools; in addition when this is regarded that, as already intimated, to many it was perhaps quite unknown that they had departed from the true opinion of Luther; how, in view of these circumstances, can one yet doubt, that about the time that Luther left the stage of action, certainly there was a decided majority for the teaching of Melanchthon? This same conclusion must be adopted from the fact, that four full years elapsed after Luther's death, before even the party of zealots, that had already been formed, before the Amsdorffs and Flacius who, already at that time, had rendered themselves conspicuous as enthusiasts for the pure teachings of the departed Lu-

ther, or rather had constituted themselves a party in opposition to Melanchthon, made the difference of opinion about these articles a subject of controversy. They were perfectly well acquainted with the fact that this difference existed, for the Amsdorffs had murmured about it even during Luther's lifetime, and had repeatedly urged the old man himself to join issue with Melanchthon on account of it. Besides this, abundant opportunities had been afforded to themselves to commence an immediate controversy on the subject, or at least to publish how far a deviation from the pure Lutheran doctrine had taken place; as Melanchthon and his friends at Wittenberg, did not find it at all necessary to conceal the departure. If therefore they nevertheless suppressed their choler, what could have been the motive but the fear that they might not find the majority of the other theologians of the party disposed to exchange again the milder dogmatic form, which Melanchthon had adopted, for the more rigid one of Luther?

This is confirmed by many of the fluctuations the synergistic controversy exhibited during its progress.¹ This controversy was waged in reference to these differences, and it must be admitted as undoubtedly certain, that it was during its continuance, and during the subsequent disputes with Flacius about his singular views of hereditary sin, many of the contemporaneous theologians became involved in scruples of conscience because of their departure from the genuine Lutheran dogmatic form. This fact these controversies exhibited to them, and they were thereby led to become more favorably disposed to the forsaken view, and even to re-adopt it. It is most certain, however, that this was not the case with all. The number of those continued to be considerable who persisted in maintaining, that the authority of Luther's name should not deter them from preserving a dogmatic form which Melanchthon had introduced into their schools, during Luther's lifetime, and that too without his approval. What, therefore, must have been the inevitable effect of the decision of the Formula of Concord upon these?

'Tis true these theologians constituted no peculiar, or at least formally organized party. They had no longer any leaders or spokesmen, since the professors chairs at Wittenberg had come to be occupied with nothing but opponents of Melanchthon. They were scattered among the mass of the others. There was therefore no reason to be much concerned about the

¹ Vid. History of the synergistic controversy, *ibid.* Bk. III. Chap. vi-xiv. Vol. I. pp. 553-690.

oppositions which they might create against the new Formula; for, at least in those places where the Formula had found favor with the ruling powers, they could easily be silenced. Yet even though they should be silent, who could hope that they had yielded to the decision made, from full and genuine conviction. This could not be expected from a single one of those who had exchanged the milder dogmatic form of Melancthon with Luther's more rigid one, with a clear and distinct knowledge of their diversity. It was hence to be expected, that there would always be a number of disaffected ones left, and even among those who had been forced to adopt the new symbol. From this source even greater detriment might accrue to Lutheran theology, at least eventually, than from the most violent protests which were filed against the Formula from other sources.

The decision of the Formula in reference to the second point in dispute, was the cause of an evil of another kind, which not only affected Lutheran theology, but the whole Lutheran Church. The question, whether, in relation to the Lord's Supper, every opinion that at any time Luther had entertained and published as his own private view, or only what was contained in the Augsburg Confession and its Apology, was to be received as the Protestant Church view, had been a continual and almost sole question of dispute among Protestant theologians since Luther's death, or more accurately since the year 1552, when Joachim Westphal resuscitated the sacramentarian controversy. 'Tis true, these new zealots for the pure Lutheran doctrine, on the subject of the Lord's Supper, would not admit that they contended simply about that one point; but maintained that they had arrayed themselves against the Calvinism which had been sought to be introduced in a secret manner, into the Lutheran Church, instead of her own teaching. This suspicion might not have been unjust as far as many an individual theologian was concerned. However that may be, they could make but the one point the subject of controversy, and the dispute always terminated upon it. This was the case already with those conducted with Hardenburg in Bremen, and in the commotions which Hesshuss originated in the Palatinate.¹

Those theologians, whom these zealots suspected of a secret leaning to the Calvinistic doctrine on the Lord's Supper, had always declared in the most emphatic manner, that they were

¹ Vid. History of the renewed sacramentarian controversy. Ibid. Bk. VI. Chap. i-xii. Bk. VII. Chap. i-xii.

ready to acknowledge a true and actual presence of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament, in the very language in which the whole Protestant Church had confessed it in the Augsburg Confession. Not satisfied with this, they desired and demanded, that they should rest the Lutheran real presence of Christ in the sacrament upon the very same grounds as Luther; because the language of the Augsburg Confession, particularly as altered by Melancthon, could only too easily be construed to teach a mere Calvinistic presence. This could not well be denied, nor that the language of the Augsburg Confession had often been used for such a purpose. Yet, admitting all this, it was still more than doubtful whether it afforded a sufficient justification for a demand of such a kind and such comprehensiveness.

These zealots insisted, that the only proper representation of the pure Lutheran doctrine on the subject of the Lord's Supper, could be given in the unaltered language of the tenth article of the Augsburg Confession, and then only in combination with the clause condemning all dissenters, which Melancthon had omitted. So far they might have gone with some appearance of justice. They soon took the unequivocal and undisguised ground, that in order to be genuinely Lutheran, on this subject, it was necessary to think of the body of Christ as being present because of its ubiquity. This, of course, involved the necessity of adopting the hypothesis of Christ's bodily ubiquity. They based their system upon the assertion, that Luther had believed in only such a presence of the body of Christ in the sacrament as presupposed its ubiquity. They ventured to draw the conclusion from this, that every one that rejected this view must necessarily have abandoned the Lutheran real presence. They hence constituted a belief in the doctrine of Christ's ubiquity, the test of genuine Lutheranism. But what did this involve but the demand, that the doctrine of the real presence was to be received in precisely that form and with all of those distinctions, which formerly had pertained to it in Luther's individual conceptions? Upon what ground could they base such a demand?

This much was true, Luther had once endeavored to prove his view of the bodily presence of Christ in the sacrament from the hypothesis of his ubiquity, or rather to answer some objections of his opponents to proofs drawn from this source. Yet he had done this only in one of his earlier controversial articles against the Swiss. It must be admitted he never formally abandoned the hypothesis; and who could ever expect Luther to do that? Yet the fact that he never made any

further use of it, but continued during the whole of his subsequent life, as he had done from the very commencement of the controversy, to draw his principal proof for the corporeal presence from the words in the institution of the sacrament ;— this fact would seem at least to show that the hypothesis of Christ's ubiquity had lost something of its importance in his eyes. But were we even compelled to concede that he always continued to ascribe to it the same importance ; even then it could at most be regarded as his own private view. It was adopted by scarcely any of the other theologians of his party ; not even by one of his associates in the sacramentarian controversy, which was maintained during his lifetime. In addition to this, it had been adopted in none of the public confessional writings of the new church ; neither in the Augsburg Confession, nor its Apology, nor in the Smalcald Articles. It had not therefore as yet attained the dignity of being regarded as a doctrine of the Lutheran Church. With what appearance of justice could they now pretend thus to avow it or to make it such ? Even if the pretext of these zealots had been well-founded in truth, that in no other way could the line of distinction be drawn between those who respectively maintained the Lutheran or Calvinistic view of Christ's presence in the sacrament, and, that in no other way could the latter be prevented from shielding themselves behind the language of the Confession ; even then they would have had no right to pursue the course adopted. Granted it were a fact, that the language of the Confession did not exclude the Calvinistic view of the real presence, and that it had often been made to teach no more than that view ; yet the Lutheran Church through her regular representatives, and Luther himself frequently during his lifetime, had declared that they were prepared to regard all as brethren in the faith who would adopt the Augsburg Confession as their own. They had made this declaration after the most mature deliberation, with the wisest reference to the well known relation of every other creed to their own, and with the most considerate and forbearing moderation towards those relations. Who, therefore, could be authorized to make more stringent demands ?

But it was not even founded in truth, that this new touchstone was absolutely necessary to discover whether some crypto-Calvinist might not have professed to find his own views in the language of the Augsburg Confession. It was unjust to suspect those theologians of a secret inclination to the Calvinistic view, who chose to employ the language of the Confession as altered by Melancthon ; for it was a settled

point that even it could embrace the true Lutheraⁿce presence. Even if those theologians declared, that they were determined never again to adopt the clause condemning all dissentients, which Melancthon had expunged from the article on the Lord's Supper, even this did not involve the necessity of their having adopted the Calvinistic view. It simply would indicate their unwillingness to pronounce judgment of condemnation upon others, and not their own apostacy to Calvinism. To secure a certain assurance, that they yet retained the Lutheran exposition, it was by no means necessary to compel them to adopt the hypothesis of Christ's ubiquity. If they had but asked the question, or induced to them to declare, whether they received the bodily presence of Christ in the sacrament because the words of the institution taught it; this would have decided the fact, whether they had any other than the Lutheran view. They would have been authorized to do that, as Luther had uniformly made the words of the institution the basis of his opinion. It had likewise been publicly declared by the whole party on more occasions than one, and had thereby become the avowed teaching of the Lutheran Church. But just as soon as they insisted that no one could adhere to the pure Lutheran view of the Lord's Supper who did not adopt the hypothesis of his ubiquity, their procedure involved the bold demand, that that hypothesis should be recognized as the teaching of the Lutheran Church. For this they had not a shadow of right, as it admitted of proof that it never had belonged to the Creed of the Church, and, at furthest, had only at one time composed part of Luther's private belief, whilst it was doubtful whether even this always continued to be the case.¹

Regardless of these facts the authors of the Formula of Concord proclaimed, as a doctrine of the Lutheran Church, that Christ, in his human nature also, could make use of the divine attribute of omnipresence. At the same time they were

¹ This point is developed most ably and convincingly in a publication, which appeared in 1582, with the following title: The very language and teaching of the Augsburg Confession, and Apology, as also of their re-issue, and of the Frankfort farewell address, on the subject of the Sacraments, and especially of the holy Eucharist; with impartial testimonies of Dr. Luther, written apart from the sacramentarian controversy, appended; in answer to the calumnies of some turbulent persons who, in violation of truth, have proclaimed that in the states and dominions of the illustrious and noble Prince and Lord, John Casimir, Count Palatine, of the Rhein &c., a doctrine has been taught on the subject of the Lord's supper in conflict with the Augsburg Confession: written for the benefit of weak consciences, led astray by such reports. Compiled and re-published in a succinct form. Neustadt on the Hardt. Quarto.

cunning enough not to refer his bodily presence in the supper primarily to this hypothesis; yet they let it be distinctly understood, that it could not be omitted in defending the Lutheran view against the objections of Calvinists. From this it naturally followed, that whoever did not receive it or regarded it as superfluous, could have no claim to the possession of the Lutheran view. Besides, as they, at the same time, declared the adoption of the Formula and subscription to it, should be regarded as the only evidence of true Lutheranism; what could be its only consequence, and what its operation, not only in reference to individual dissenters, but to the whole Church?

The party of pretended enthusiasts for the pure Lutheran doctrine, who had digested this plan, in reality to secure for themselves a constant domination in the church, by means of the Formula, could not themselves have regarded it as possible to induce all, who dissented from them on the subject of the Lord's supper, either by persuasion or compulsion to adopt it. The situation of the greater part of these dissenters, was essentially different from that of the most of those, whose imputed errors were condemned for the first time in the Formula. The most of the latter had really departed from Luther's doctrine, or at least from the mode of exposition and expression current in the church. They themselves were conscious of this departure, and, whilst they could scarcely be expected willingly to subscribe to their own condemnation, they would be compelled to admit, that there were plausible reasons to charge them with such departure. At the same time, they might not concede to their opponents the right to condemn them for it. If, therefore, it was announced to such, that they could no longer be regarded as being in fellowship with the Lutheran church, provided they retained their views; such a course would not seem to have been altogether improper, because by their views they had already separated themselves from the church. Because of the very fact, that they had, virtually separated themselves from the decided majority of the Lutheran faith, there was not much to be feared from a formal declaration of their excision. How entirely different, on the other hand, was it with those who were accused of a departure from the pure Lutheran faith on the subject of the Lord's supper? They never had purposed departing from that doctrine on the subject which the Lutheran church had professed in her public Confession. The greater part of them perhaps did not as much as know, that their view lacked an idea or a distinction that had ever belonged to Luther's individual opinion. Those, however, that did know

it could justly appeal to the fact, that they never had departed from the faith of the church as she had published it. Even if there were some, who, in addition to this, were aware that, by the rejection of that hypothesis, they had approached somewhat nearer to the Calvinistic view — yea, even if many had had the design of actually approximating to that view — they might have been sincere in the belief that the church never had wished a wider separation from it. What, therefore, would be the consequence of striving in the new Formula of Concord to impose upon such men, in the shape of the hypothesis of Christ's ubiquity, a distinction in reference to the doctrine of the Lord's supper, which, according to their most positive convictions, was neither tenable, nor capable of proof, nor had ever been a doctrine of the church?

This alone could be the result, and this alone was the result, that not only a number of individual theologians but also a number of whole churches, which had hitherto belonged to the Lutheran party, gradually approximated nearer to the Calvinists, and soon formally and fully united with them. In the year 1580, at the time of the publication of the Formula, there were but two churches, in Germany that had positively declared themselves for the Calvinistic doctrine on the Lord's supper: that at Bremen, and another at Neustadt, on the Hardt, in that part of the Palatinate which had come into the possession of the Count Palatine, John Casimir, and where he had his residence. At the close of the century however, and therefore, within the next twenty or thirty years, perhaps fully one-fourth of all the Protestant churches in the empire had given in their full adhesion to this party. This was such a natural consequence, that it could not fail to follow. Already during the preliminary negotiations, which had been conducted before the publication of the Formula, on the subject of its adoption, the ministers of a number of churches, as for instance of Hesse Cassel, of Nassau, of Anhalt, and of Zweibrücken, had declared, in the most positive manner, that they never would submit to having the hypothesis of Christ's ubiquity forced upon them, neither as a collateral idea in the doctrine of the supper, nor as a distinctive idea of the doctrine of the person of Christ. Yet these very churches, in part declared just as decidedly, that they had every disposition to retain and profess the true Lutheran presence of Christ, as contained in the language of the Augsburg Confession, and that too of the unaltered edition.¹ It was thus they suffi-

¹ Vid, Vol. III, Bk. x, Chap. v.—viii.

ciently legitimated themselves as true members of that church, that had adopted this confession as her own, and hitherto had made nothing else than its reception the condition of her communion. In the Formula, however, faith in this ubiquity received the stamp as an article of the Lutheran Church creed. They proclaimed thereby that all that did not adopt it, were no longer members of the Lutheran Church. It was soon loudly maintained, that they could no longer participate in the advantages of the religious peace which had only been concluded with the Lutheran party. They were told to their faces, that they could be regarded as nothing more than Calvinists; yea they were even generally distinguished by the name Crypto-Calvinists. What, therefore, could be more natural than that disaffection and bitterness, and, at the same time, prudence and self-defence should lead many of them to throw themselves fully into the arms of the Calvinists, and actually transform them into what they had previously, with the greatest injustice, been proclaimed?

It thus happened, and that too in the natural course of things, that the very party which they had desired more particularly to suppress by means of the Formula of Concord—that the Calvinistic party, now for the first time obtained such a footing, that the continuance of its existence was secured forever in Germany. This was the unfortunate consequence which primarily accrued to the Lutheran Church from the movement. On the other hand, her theology secured this advantage, that, for a century and a half, it remained fixed to the point to which it had been bound by the Formula.¹

[¹ We are aware that the attempt has been made, by some recent writers of a certain school, both in Germany and this country, to invalidate the testimony of Dr. Plank as to the baneful influence of the adoption of the Formula of Concord upon our church. We feel bound, for the present, simply to state, that such attempts have been made in the very face of impartial history and undeniable facts. It is beyond controversy, that it was rejected not only by those principalities that subsequently became Reformed, but also by many states and kingdoms that never deserted the Lutheran standard; and in some other cases it was robbed of its binding authority, in less than a half century after it had been formally adopted.] Tn.

ARTICLE IX.

REFLECTIONS ON THE CONDITION OF THE NORWEGIAN CHURCH.

REMINISCENCES OF A VISIT TO THAT COUNTRY IN 1847.

Translated by the Rev. B. M. Schmucker, A. M., Martinsburg, Va.

ARTICLE II.

AT the time of my visit, the public mind was just becoming tranquil after a violent struggle, which, as it involved their doctrinal confession, was conducted with an acrimony, that convinced me that great religious inflammability as well as a decided religious life was to be met with in Norway. This consideration increased with my longer sojourn in the country. The contest had been waged by the laity against the clergy; the leaders of the still existing religious associations of the laity which had been commenced by Hans Hange, on the one hand, and a number of the most influential of the Norwegian Theologians on the other being engaged in it. It arose from a measure of the government. The abridgement of the Exposition of Luther's Smaller Catechism, by Erik Pontoppidan, which had been in common use, being found no longer suited to the wants of the church, a committee of three members was appointed, by the government, in 1839, to prepare a new edition with suitable amendments. After three years, the task committed to them was accomplished, and, on the 14th of July 1843, a royal mandate appeared which enjoined the introduction of the new edition of the Catechism in the schools, in the instruction of the candidates for confirmation, as also in the usual catechetical exercises of the clergy. The amended edition had many advantages; it may deservedly be said that the committee were cautious in their alterations. The only material alteration was in the answer to the question concerning Christ's descent into hell. Pontoppidan had stated that its design was, that Christ desired to exhibit the victory over Satan which he had obtained by his death; the amended edition added to this, that he might preach the Gospel to the spirits which were in prison, with a reference to 1 Pet. 3: 18, 19. 4: 6. The only verbal alteration which at least might be misunderstood, was, that where in Pontoppidan's Catechism among the things which are plainly to be avoided as sinful or likely to lead us astray, the luxuries of life, even though of spirit-

ual nature, are mentioned by name, in the revised edition there is a general expression ; every thing which fosters the lust of the eyes, the lust of the flesh and the pride and luxury of life was substituted for it. We would naturally expect that its publication would not be permitted to pass silently by. The Catechism was scarcely published, until it proved a fire-brand thrown among the congregations. Within the jurisdiction of many of the Provosts a decided disturbance arose, excited and directed for the most part by the followers of Hange, who thought they were especially called to be watchmen of Zion to maintain the Lutheran Confession inviolate. The general indignation was directed against one, who, of all the clergy had been the greatest favorite, as a writer, with the people ; to whom, as he himself informs us, many bore witness that he had exerted a blessed influence on a multitude of souls ; whose writings, and especially his "Manual of Devotion for general use," attained (in seven editions,) a more than ordinary circulation—Wilhelm Andr. Wepels. The fact that he had hitherto been the most widely popular as a writer, was the reason that he was now held responsible for the alterations introduced in the new edition, although he was not its editor. Wepels received a number of verbal and written communications, and thus the strife commenced. Some of these were letters with the signature of the authors, who, perplexed by the insinuations of his enemies, in their unbounded confidence in him, besought, in the greatest consternation, that he would explain the step which had caused these charges. The rest, much more numerous than the former, were anonymous pieces, in which he was loaded with the most silly accusations, and called a teacher of error, a forerunner of Antichrist and a servant of Satan. But it did not end here. Large meetings were held and prayer unceasingly offered to the Lord of the Church, that he would not permit so novel, false, and pernicious an error to enter the church, and pollute the unsullied bride of Christ. In many congregations it was unanimously decided, that hereafter no one should be allowed to use any of the writings of the traitor to the Church, and any who continued to use the "Manual of Devotion" by Wepels, were under the ban of public censure.

This feeling, however, was not universal, but was only manifested where the Hangian influence was strongest, especially in the spheres of action of those who considered themselves as the legitimate successors of Hans Hange, on whom, as upon the Prophet of old, the mantle of their predecessor had fallen, as at Drammen, Kongsberg, Frederikshald, Trondhjem,

and in many rural districts. But those who were discontented on account of the alterations which had been made, feeling that great injury might be caused by them, were not satisfied with this agitation. There was still danger that the congregations would be compelled to adopt the Catechism which they now disliked. The matter was brought before the Storting, the highest civil authority in the land, and thus became a national concern. Wepels, in the name of the committee which had been attacked, and of the highest authority in the church which had appointed it, and also in behalf of the ministry to which he belonged, as well as in self-defence, published a defence of their course. This work, entitled, *Public explanation to my fellow christians of my views and published statements concerning Christ's descent into hell, and the possibility of a saving change after death*, was published at Christiana, 1845. The course of argument which he followed in it cannot, of course, be shown here. We can only say, that in the first part he proposes to establish the accordance of the views he had expressed concerning Christ's descent into hell with the Scriptures, to answer the objections made on account of the dangerous practical tendencies of the doctrine, and to establish their agreement with the apostolic creed publicly acknowledged in baptism, and the symbols of the Ev. Lutheran Church, to which they had been obligated in confirmation. In the second part he repels the charge of novelty made to his doctrines. I cannot forbear to introduce here an explanation of the worthy author which well deserves consideration, furnishing an example which many of the clergy of Germany would do well to follow. "As a minister of the Ev. Lutheran Church of Norway," says he, "I am bound to them (namely the Symbolical books, among which the Formula Concordiae does not hold a place), by a solemn oath, so that if I can no longer subscribe to them, but am compelled by conscientious convictions to reject their teachings, it would be my imperative duty to resign my office. For I could never ease my conscience with the false pretence, that I had only obligated myself that my teachings should be accordant with the symbolical books, in as far as these were accordant, (i. e. in as far as I considered them accordant,) with the Bible, as a pretence which renders all confessional obligation an unmeaning form, and indeed scarcely of greater significance than an obligation to the Koran, or any other book. If, therefore, my explanation of the Scriptures should be at variance with the symbols to which I have been solemnly obligated, I must either discard those explanations, or resign my position in the church.

But the Augsburg Confession, which explicitly comes into question, allows, God be praised, greater freedom in the exposition of the Scriptures, and thus far I have never felt the limits which it sets too narrow. And so long as I do not reject any part of these symbols, I can safely differ from any of the Lutheran divines, and even from Luther himself, where I find that he has been mistaken, so he himself has said, and is so clear as to need no proof." Such a declaration is truly worthy of a Norwegian divine; it is firm and honest, and clearly shows the position which many of the most distinguished Norwegian clergy assume, at the present time, in relation to the symbols.

Almost simultaneously with Wepel's defence, which was throughout much in the same tone, appeared a publication of his opponents, in which, for the first time, they entered minutely into the consideration of the points in dispute, and brought against the committee the charge that they made broad the narrow road that leadeth to heaven. It appeared anonymously, but was evidently the work of one of the followers of Hange, and it soon was considered as a declaration of war of the whole party against Wepels. The latter published a brief reply, in which the friends of Hange are specifically designated as his principal opponents. The contest began to be waged between distinct parties, and instead of drawing to a close seemed to be but rightly enkindled. A publication appeared at Frederikshald in 1845, not anonymously as before, for Wepels had taken exception to that in the other, but with the name of the author, Ole Nielsen, attached. The readiness in the use of the pen displayed in this treatise by a layman, and one not of the educated class of the community was astonishing, and can only be accounted for by the very thorough and excellent parental training, and home culture of the agricultural class, which often produces more favorable results than the most judiciously organized system of public instruction. It would be interesting, as well as profitable to follow the truly excellent thoughts of the Norwegian farmer, furnishing, as they do, an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the religious views of the Hangean party, but this would require a more extended account of the contest than accords with our present purpose to furnish. I can only say, that the work lays great stress on the doctrines of a universal priesthood, new birth, making a belief in them an essential pre-requisite to a proper understanding of the Holy Scriptures, that it abounds in allegory, and contains also many happy illustrations of Scripture. Written in a style which the people could

readily understand, and which they loved, it obtained an extended circulation, and assisted not a little to increase the popular excitement against the new Catechism. In 1847, again there appeared another pamphlet—a mere reprint of Pontoppidan's views on the condition of the soul after death, edited, not as before by one of the uneducated mass, but by a man of cultivation. It seems to have been intended to exert an irenical influence—it accomplished, however, but little. Neither party was satisfied with it. The excitement continued constantly to extend, so as to excite serious apprehension. Wepels was attacked by a severe and dangerous illness which brought him near to the grave. To what extent the troubles of the times contributed to heighten it, cannot, of course, be determined; there is but little doubt that his anxiety of mind delayed his restoral. In the mean time, the excitement which had arisen among the people, and by which many of the steadier part of the community had been carried along, could no longer be ignored by the government. The Hangean party had obtained a power and influence in the congregations of Norway which could not be overlooked, and the less, because many had given in their adherence to it, who would otherwise be indisposed to have any connection with it, but who apprehended real injury to the Lutheran doctrine from the further circulation of the altered edition of Pontoppidan's Catechism. Petition after petition for the withdrawal of the royal imprimatur from the new edition was sent in, the clergy were compelled by their congregations to discontinue the use of the work provided by the committee, to be employed in the schools, and the instruction of catechumens, so that the government was compelled, not indeed entirely to recall the appointment of the book,—for that would have been contradicting themselves—but to modify the ordinance of July 14th, 1843, which had aroused so fierce a storm. The use of the old edition of Luther's Catechism, with Pontoppidan's exposition, had been allowed by the royal decree until the close of the year 1848, this limit was removed by a new decree, and as pastor Wepels informed me, with his approval, it was for the future allowed each congregation with their minister to decide, which of three Catechisms should be employed in the instruction of the young; the *Catechismus plenus* (Larger catechism) of Erik Pontoppidan, or the old abridgment, or the amended abridgment. In vain were the opposers of the new edition besought not to overlook or reject the advantages of the whole on account of a single part; in vain were they reminded, that if they believed the doctrine of a possible conversion after

death to be unscriptural, they need not understand Christ's preaching to the spirits in prison to be a preaching of repentance, but an annunciation of wrath and judgment. A distrust of the orthodoxy of the Catechism had extended itself widely, and was hard to be removed from a people whose sincere, honest, truth-loving spirit hated all accommodation, and all many-sided representations. Perhaps scarcely a third of the country churches, and not all in the cities had introduced the new Catechism, although the Society for the diffusion of religious books, at Christiana, had spared no effort to extend its circulation, having distributed an edition of five thousand copies, partly gratis, and partly at very low prices.

The public strife began, therefore, gradually to cease. Congregations were contented with the privilege secured to them of determining which catechism should be used within their bounds. Such was the posture of affairs at the time of my visit to Norway. The Storthing seemed to be concerned almost entirely about the interests of the people and of the clergy, and to be strangely negligent in their attention to religious ecclesiastical affairs. The excitement, which had so lately filled the souls of the Norwegians, was doubtless still vibrating within. Even Wepels seemed scarcely as yet to have become entirely tranquil; it must have been especially painful that his influence as an author, which had been so extensive, had suffered a severe blow. But I must confess, that although he received much personal abuse, although the troubles which enemies and sickness had caused had but lately passed over his head and may have whitened his locks, yet did he not once give utterance to a severe or embittered judgment concerning his opponents. With pity—a smile playing in his countenance—he related some examples of the suspicions which had been raised concerning him, that many simple souls literally trampled before him and his writings, as though they were real personal tempters, going about seeking to lure their poor souls into the snare of destruction. He informed us with evident pain, that the friends of Hange, who had hitherto been so ardently and constantly attached to him, some of whom had even been among his intimate friends, had now forsaken him, under the influence of a few extreme, spiritually conceited leaders, who were honored by their followers with the title of Prophets, who were esteemed and lauded as martyrs to the good Lutheran cause, and who succeeded, among the less independent members of their party, in casting suspicion on his conduct. But this was all he allowed himself to say concerning them.

If we turn for a moment to review the contest through which we have passed, there are three aspects of it which strike us as worthy of notice. It bears decided testimony, that in the Norwegian church there courses a life, a truly active christian life, especially among the laity; for most of the people took part in it, some as acting, others observing, some assaulting, others suffering. And this life—the second inference—has lately taken a decidedly confessional direction, so that the Norwegian church pre-eminently deserves to be considered as the most zealous for the confessions, for the arguments urged with greatest force against Wepels views all resolved themselves into this, that the heroes of the Lutheran confession, first of all Luther, and then Pontoppidan, the Gerhard of the Norwegian church, had taught differently. An important practical result of the struggle, which may hereafter be of the greatest significance,—the third aspect to which we would direct attention, was, that the congregations and laity had obtained a voice in determining the doctrines which should be taught in churches and schools, or at least could now venture to express their opinion clearly and decidedly. But it is evident that the contest could never have secured this, if the first factor, the community of believers, raised up by Hange and other lay-preachers, and drawn into close union with each other for mutual edification, had not already become an important, influential element in the state.

A question here arises which will lead us to a closer examination of the condition of the Norwegian church. *How did lay-preaching obtain so great an influence, that it ventured to make such decided resistance to the most eminent clergymen of the established church, and even against a work which had been undertaken in obedience to a royal command, and which appeared accompanied by a royal mandate enjoining its use, as to secure the removal of the mandate against the will of the administration, and of the larger part of the clergy, and to raise such obstacles to its execution as to nullify its legal force.* In answering this, we will be led to see the advantages and the disadvantages of the Norwegian church, and may perhaps discover a plan by which the latter may gradually be removed. The causes, which enter into the explanation of the inquiry just made, seem to be fivefold. The religiousness of the people in general, their history, the character and condition of the lay-preachers the relation sustained by the clergy to their congregations, and the very limited participation in the affairs of individual congregations, and of the national church, which has been allowed the laity.

The principal source of the effectiveness and influence of the Norwegian lay-preachers, or as they call themselves, confessors, lies in the *religiousness of the people*. The declension of religion and morality, and a rapidly increasing worldly spirit, are still the cause of frequent lamentation, especially among the clergy. Yet, I believe I am warranted in the statement, that the Norwegian, or Scandinavian in general, shares with the German the honor of possessing an extraordinary capacity, and an eager preference for the spiritual and divine, and therefore has part with him in the important mission, too often claimed for the German people alone, of being the principal instrumentality in the realization of the kingdom of God on earth. We need not go back to the times which preceded the introduction of Christianity into Scandinavia for the proof of this statement, although they would furnish abundant testimony clearly to demonstrate the deep religious feeling of the northern people. Their mythological system, like that of the southern nations of antiquity, was earthly and sensuous. But while the Hellenic system sunk gradually into a lower sensuous life, instead of conforming the latter to a higher world, the Scandinavians constantly strove to purify theirs from every thing evil, imperfect and earth-born in its nature. An elevated moral earnestness, though at times rude and impetuous, runs through their mythology. While the southern nations made their gods mere representatives of their own life, the Scandinavians endeavored to copy the life of their gods with a reverence which amounted to slavish fear. Even the most unimportant occurrences were made to bear some relation to the super-sensuous world. In short, the classic mythology was in subjective dependence on man, but the Scandinavian mythology seemed to have no such dependence on the spiritual nature of man, but rather directed him, for their original religious inclinations had given their mythological system a position so external to themselves, that it seemed to be an independent objective power, exerting a reflex influence on them. It is probable that the susceptibility to the elements of the Asiatic (Indian) religious notions, which the aboriginal Scandinavians exhibited at the time of the immigration of the demi-gods from south-east, (Asia, probably India, Persia, Caucasasia) must be attributed to these original religious inclinations. We might also refer to the despotic power which, from their religious prominence alone, those demi-gods succeeded in obtaining over the early Northmen, by the air of mysteriousness in which they invested themselves. We cannot now more than allude

to the immovable fidelity with which the Scandinavians clung to their Odin religion, and the decided energy, arising from this devotion, with which they so long resisted the introduction of Christianity, and the tenacity and steadfastness with which, when once gained to its cause, they have maintained it. We can only adduce some of the evidences which the present furnishes. We may mention *the universal reverence shown for the Holy Scriptures*. A religious feeling among a christian people manifests itself in a careful attention to the specific demands of Christianity. This reverence for the Bible was still manifest, even in times of scepticism and unbelief, and no one ventured publicly to express his scornful ridicule of God's Word. How different the case in France, England and Germany, at the same period. *An eager desire for reading*, especially books of a religious character, is a necessary consequence of this religious spirit, although in later times, since their political condition has excited a deep interest among the people, it must be conceded that a strong predilection for works of a political cast has been manifested. The Society for the distribution of religious books, established at Christiana, states, in its late report, that between 1826-1841, they have distributed 125,000 vols. (catechisms, books of devotion, and instructive narratives and treatises,) in part gratuitously, in part at prices merely covering the expense of publication; so that, if equally distributed, each family might have obtained a copy. In connection with this desire for religious reading, there is manifested a decided preference for such books as present religion in its connection with the mysterious, with miracles, and God's immediate revelation to man, showing a sympathy with the remains of Romish or even Heathen superstition, still here and there to be found. Even though such lamentable manifestations of religious preference seldom appear to the public in print, their influence is still exercised by traditions transmitted from generation to generation, especially among the mass engaged in rural pursuits. But exhibitions of religious consciousness in so imperfect a form occur but seldom, and always among the less cultivated portion of the nation. And can we be astonished at it among a people whom nature has largely endowed with a love of the marvellous, whose power over the imagination, the long night and twilight of its continuance has tended to strengthen? When this is taken into the account, we will not be so much astonished, that about ten years ago, they yielded implicit credence, and gave in their adherence to a man who claimed to have been honored with an immediate revelation from God, and who showed by his whole

course, and the performance of his duties—he was a sacristan—that he was incapable of intentional deception. Lew Hansen Sener—to give a brief sketch of the movement—sacristan at Praestegjeld, after attending to his usual devotions, lay down to sleep. “I had not slept long,” he narrates, “until I thought I saw a man of wan appearance, clothed in white, enter the door and seat himself on a chair by my bed-side. I trembled, was afraid to breathe. He calmly drew a paper from his pocket and handed it to me, saying, I am sent by God to show you this paper. On the paper were written the following verses (which we may thus translate,): As long as thou dost earnestly root out all sin from thy heart and soul and mind, I will never free thee from the pains of hell. But when thou findest delight in renouncing all lust, without reserve or concealment, I give thee my promise to sustain and assist the soul which has no power out of me. Then shalt thou with joy experience how kind a God I am. Be faithful, watch and pray on earth, and when thou diest, thou shalt be admitted to a place at my right hand. * * * * *

As I read these verses, I felt an inexpressible joy; the messenger arose and passed out of the room. After he left I awoke, being much agitated, and immediately wrote down the verses, not a little astonished that I, who never before or since have attempted any thing of the kind, should be writing verses.” The good man did not know how he could turn this event to a better purpose, than by relating it frequently, connecting excellent reflections and admonitions with it. He was listened to with much believing attention by the people, and thus, although intellectually a weak instrument, was the means of doing good to many. I have narrated this occurrence, though in itself unimportant, as it appeared to me to show the capacity of the people, (for the sacristan was one of the lower classes,) to be the subjects of religious influences, and also themselves to exert such influence. If we would seek further evidences of the religious disposition of the Norwegian people, we might refer to the continued existence of a strong church-feeling, of which we have had exhibitions within the present half century. There are many families in which the festivals, which the church authorities have without reason stricken from the list of ecclesiastical days, are still religiously observed. I mention only holy Dreikönigsfest, which is still observed in the family as carefully as Christmas, although it has not been recognized by the church since 1770, and the portion of Scripture appointed to be read for the day, was never admitted into the list

of the Gospels and Epistles. It is interesting to attend public worship on the Sabbath in the country. All around the church gates we see, especially on the festivals, or occasions of confirmation, a great bulwark of carriages, two wheeled vehicles, in which the catechumens have been conveyed from two or three miles to the church, and in the house many mothers with their small children, from whom they could not be separated so long and have brought with them rather than remain at home, and after service we see them gathering on and around their vehicles, under the shade of the dense fir trees, partaking of their simple meal. As I witnessed these things I could not but feel that though the poor people have that bread, whereof if a man eat he shall never hunger, they do not obtain it without sacrifices. Notwithstanding these local disadvantages, the churches are generally well attended. Do not these things show an interest in religion and the church, though frequently they are owing to legal enactments? If we now cast a glance at the higher classes of the Norwegian people, which of course are not a fair representative of the people in general, we cannot fail to perceive strong traces of religious feeling, although its influence is confined to narrower circles, and many are given up to religious indifference. The religiousness of this class of the community finds a beautiful expression in the silent influence of a number of highly cultivated, noble females, whose names are well known in Norway, whose talents are devoted to the advancement of the interests of Christ's kingdom, whose labors in behalf of christian aims are untiring. They have been exerting themselves to do good by word, by the press, and by deed. The Eugenia Institute for the education of neglected female children, owes its existence to one of these ladies. Another has beautifully and effectively set forth the Christian principle, for families of higher cultivation, in published dialogue between a mother and her daughter. A third, by her simple but impressive religious poems, (among others Bible stories,) has reclaimed many a wanderer to the ways of truth. We might also mention as another proof of the religious disposition of the nation, the fact that the principal organ of public information, the Morning News, frequently gives a more prominent place to pieces of religious poetry than to political events. Could the editor of a German paper venture on such a course without making himself the object of general dislike, or even ridicule? Even the officers of the State, who for a time maintained an indifferent, or an inimical position toward the church and the cause of religion in general, have forsaken it, and are assuming a more friendly, or at

least more tolerant relation toward the clergy and active members of the church, although it is difficult to decide whether much of this change must not be attributed to the influence of popular religious feeling on them. Those, who have mingled freely in the circles of Norwegian officials, must be impressed with the conviction that the poisonous influence of modern German speculative exegesis and pseudo-critical trifling, has been as yet but little felt in these northern regions, and I venture to prophecy that any attempt to introduce into Scandinavia, the artificial religion of pure reason, which is inculcated with so much energy in southern Europe, will meet with insurmountable difficulties in the sober moral earnestness, and, above all, the deep religiousness of the Norwegians. If there were nothing else to sustain me in the assertion, the susceptibility to the influence of the lay-preachers, and especially of Hauge, which was shown by the majority of the agricultural population, would suffice; and the very existence of lay-preaching is a sufficient proof of the more than ordinary religious capacity of this people. The fuel was furnished in their national individuality, to which it was necessary only to apply the spark, and their whole nature would glow with the holy fervor of a living faith in Christ; nothing could therefore be more natural, than that the Haugean movement should extend with wonderful rapidity, and produce the most striking results. And when once such an awakening to repentance and faith had been aroused, it became necessary to enter into new and closer combinations for the maintenance of the newly awakened life of faith; and this was the more needful, as at that time the shepherds seem almost entirely to have been asleep, and to have left the folds to care for themselves. The sermon and Sabbath was almost the only communication between clergymen and their congregations, and when we remember the spirit of the men by whom these sermons were read, we can readily conceive that they exerted but little cohesive influence. As we would naturally expect, these combinations began to gather round the men by whom they were originated, and the guidance of their occasional meetings was given over entirely into their hands. A necessary result of this plan of action was, that the lay-preachers and leaders of prayer-meetings, among whom Hans Hauge held a prominent place, obtained great authority over the mass of those who had been awakened by their preaching.

Thus lay-preaching, and the exercise of religious influence by the laity became an important element, before the clergy awoke from their slumber, and obtained a decided advantage

over the regular administration of religion through the church. Those whose religious character was active and sincere, felt more aroused and edified by the simple, artless, but earnest, energetic exhortations of a lay-preacher, especially of Hauge, than by the barren, dry results of writing—desk-labor, which were usually heard at the places of public worship. A large part of the nation, therefore, beheld their efforts with delight, although, on the other hand, the strangeness of lay-preaching gave offence to many, and aroused, here and there, opposition, which however gradually diminished as the blessed results of their efforts began more clearly to appear. It was still possible, when Haugeanism had not cut itself entirely loose from the church, but was accessible to a kindly christian influence on the part of the clergy, to regain the alienated lay-preachers and their followers, by an acknowledgment of previous neglect, and a judicious course toward them, and by causing the pure word of God to be declared again from the pulpit, in patience, love and humility. But instead of this the clergy thundered from the pulpit at the impostors, false prophets, conceited fanatics, and even went so far as to employ the arm of civil power against “the disturbers of the public peace.”—They misunderstood the high purpose for which they were raised, they discouraged and repulsed the peace-loving members of their churches hungering after the bread of life, and they did it in a manner so little accordant with the spirit of love, that they had well nigh caused a separation from the church, which the correct views of Hauge and his adherents alone prevented. They have caused, to a great extent, the unhappy relation which not only the followers of Hauge, but the friends of lay-preaching in general still sustain to the truly evangelical clergy, manifesting, as they do, a spirit watchful, hesitating, suspicious, rather than full of confiding trust. The persecutions to which Hauge and some of his adherents were subjected, not only brought his party in a position extraneous to, and distrustful of the constituted authorities of the church, if not even inimical to them, but they excited the sympathies of the whole nation for the injured christians, and gave them an increased importance and influence in spiritual things. By taking these circumstances into view, in connection with the religious susceptibility of the Norwegian people, we can understand how the movement of the lay-preachers came to obtain so great an influence.

ARTICLE X.

SEARS' LIFE OF LUTHER.

THE LIFE OF LUTHER; *with special reference to its earlier periods and the opening scenes of the Reformation*, By Barnas Sears, D. D. PHILADELPHIA: American Sunday School Union, &c.

THIS work made its appearance nearly a year since, and we are therefore surprised that it has not before this been noticed, (so far as we are aware), either in the newspapers of the Lutheran Church, or in the *Evangelical Review*. Both the literary standing of Dr. Sears, and the auspices under which the book is published, (the Am. Sunday School Union), would seem to call for something of the kind. Apart from this, however, the book has merits of its own to commend it. It is got up in a very handsome style, both internally and externally—is a stout volume of nearly 500 pages 16mo., very handsomely bound in embossed and gilt muslin, printed in a clear type upon excellent paper, and with numerous wood cuts, ornamented initials, vignettes, &c. executed in the very best style of the art. We have met nothing printed in this country that has given us higher satisfaction than these pictorial illustrations. The portraits both of Luther and of his wife, the latter especially, are very fine. The maps also, one of the "*Journey from Mansfield to Magdeburg*," and the other, "*from Erfurt to Wittenberg*," are very satisfactory, and throw great light upon the historical narrative.

Dr. Sears also has performed his part of the work in a manner highly creditable to him both as a writer and as a scholar. He has evidently studied his subject well, both in the original and latest authorities, and upon the spots rendered memorable by the deeds of faith and acts of moral heroism there performed. The opening chapter is a very fair specimen of this, and we give its first paragraphs as a sample of the tone and manner of the book generally:

"Some twenty-five miles northwest of Leipzig is situated the old town of Halle, on the Saale. From this town, the road running to the west, after crossing a fertile plain, leads to a romantic spot, at a distance of ten miles, where the hills of south-western Saxony begin to rise, and the flat lands, extending all the way from the Baltic Sea, reach their termination. There the road, passing between two beautiful sheets of water,

the one fresh and the other salt, enters a vale, with ranges of vine-clad hills on either side, which become wider and wider, till, at the distance of nearly ten miles, it contracts again, and the heights that bounded it converge and form the varied and pleasant scenery of Eisleben, once the capital of the county of Mansfeld. As the traveller enters the town, he leaves, on the left, before proceeding very far, the house where Luther was born, now converted into an edifice for the accommodation of an orphan school. In the same quarter of the city a few rods to the east, is St. Peter's church, where, according to the custom of the times, the boy was, on the very next day after his birth, baptized and christened Martin, as that happened to be St. Martin's day. This circumstance is highly characteristic of the religious sentiments of that age. The senses and the imagination were employed, more, perhaps, than the heart, in the service of religion. The infant child was to be brought at once, in imagination at least, into connection with a saint; and it was believed that an association of the name would be adapted to awaken in him a corresponding association of ideas. The font, which was used on that occasion, is still shown to the curious traveller."

Here, however, we already see indications of the writer's sectarian (Baptistic) views, which disqualify him from doing justice to various aspects of Luther's life. He does not regard *infant baptism* as a usage of *the church*, but merely a "custom of the times." No greater sympathy has he with Luther's views of the other sacrament, so that we are not much surprised that here he ceases to defend, and scarcely represents with ordinary fairness, the course and conduct of his subject, going, on the other hand, into a labored defence of Carlstadt. "For three centuries," says he, "Carlstadt's moral character has been treated somewhat as Luther's would have been, if only Catholic testimony had been heard. The party interested has been both witness and judge. What if we were to judge of Zwingli's christian character by Luther's representations? The truth is, Carlstadt hardly showed a worse spirit, or employed more abusive terms toward Luther, than Luther did toward him. Carlstadt knew that in many things the truth was on his side, and yet in these, no less than in others, he was crushed by the civil power which was on the side of Luther." * * * * "The most important difference between him and Luther, and that which most embittered the latter against him, related to the Lord's Supper. He opposed not only transubstantiation, but *consubstantiation*, the real presence, and

the elevation and adoration of the host. Luther rejected the first, *asserted the second and third*, and allowed the other two."

These are truly singular statements for a professed historian to make. "The party interested has been both witness and judge"! This means, of course, that Luther's judgment of Carlstadt has been received by all the world, without examination, as finally conclusive against him. Now we know, that this has not been the fact in regard to any of Luther's opinions, and least of all have they been so received in regard to Carlstadt, who has had an abundance of defenders and apologists both in his own day and in ours. Witness Zwingle, and Oecolampadius, and nearly every English writer who discusses this subject. But how desperate the case is, we may judge from the admissions which even Dr. Sears, his latest defender, is here compelled to make. "But Carlstadt was also a mystic, following the inward light. Hence his sympathy with the *Zwickau prophets*. He was a singular compound of Zwinglian, [this is an anachronism] Lutheran, and Anabaptist ingredients." p. 362. And even this poor compliment is too favorable a statement. D'Aubigne's statement is the uniform voice of history. "Carlstadt even went further than this; he began to announce his contempt for studies; and the old professor was heard recommending his class, from his chair, to return home, resume the spade and the plough, and quietly cultivate the earth, since it was in the sweat of his brow that man was to eat his bread."! Hist. Ref. III. 279 (Kelly's Transl.) Nor can any thing be more unjust than Dr. Sears' presentation of Carlstadt (p. 361) as a defender of the Scripture canon against Luther, when it is well known that in 1520, in his book *De canonicis scripturis*, Carlstadt expressed his doubts as to the genuineness and authority of the five books of Moses. See Guericke K. G. III, p. 84.

It is almost superfluous for us to say that the declaration, that "Luther asserted the doctrine of consubstantiation" is a gross misunderstanding, not to say misrepresentation of his doctrine. Dr. Sears, as a man who has studied theology, ought to know better, even if some who call themselves Lutherans and profess to teach the doctrines of the Church, either for the purpose of casting odium upon the faith they should defend, or out of the most inexcusable ignorance, countenance the application of this term, which it has ever rejected, to the eucharistic doctrine of our church. As Lutherans we protest against the appearance of such statements in the publications of the American Sunday School Union, which are professedly for the

benefit of all evangelical christians. This misrepresentation is found in another work issued by that society, ("Sketches of Church-history," if our memory serves us as to the title, but which, unfortunately, we have not just now at hand.). How can Lutherans be expected to coöperate with an institution publishing statements which they regard as so injurious to them? But we have no doubt, that this thing has been done inadvertently, and that the society will correct it as soon as it is properly brought to its notice, which will, we trust, be done without delay.—But to return to Dr. Sears:

He does Luther equal injustice in the representation which he makes of his course in reference to the "War of the Peasants," as it is commonly called. Here (p. 363) he says: "Against the peasants, who on the one hand, were driven to desperation by the oppression of their rulers, and, on the other, were intoxicated with the new ideas of liberty which had just begun to be proclaimed, Luther wrote and spoke in terms of unmitigated severity. He was a better theologian than politician. * * * But that he should proclaim doctrines subversive of all principles of freedom, and be the means of riveting more firmly the already galling chains of despotism, and of exciting the despots to a bloody revenge, is a matter of regret, if not of wonder." So far is this from being a correct statement of Luther's course in this matter, that it may almost be said to have been diametrically opposite. D'Aubigne correctly says (III, 322,): "Luther thought with Melancthon respecting the revolt, but he had a heart that throbbed for the sorrows of the people. He showed himself highly impartial on this occasion, and spoke the truth frankly to both parties. He first addressed the princes, and more particularly the bishops. "It is you," he said to them, "who are the cause of the revolt; it is your declamations against the gospel; it is your guilty oppression of the little ones of the Church, that have driven the people to despair. . . . Dear lords, for the love of God abandon your resentment, treat reasonably with these poor people, as with drunken and misguided men. Allay these troubles by gentleness, lest there issue from them a conflagration that shall lay hold on all Germany. *Amongst their twelve articles there are some that are just and equitable.*"

That Luther's ideas in regard to civil government were in advance of his age, we might show even from these addresses to the peasants, which are declared by Dr. S. to be "subversive of all the principles of freedom, and to rivet more firmly the already galling chains of despotism." Here is the remedy

which he proposes for the evils in which society was then involved: "Therefore my advice would be, to select several counts and gentlemen from among the nobility, and from the [free] cities several counsellors, and to have them in a friendly way investigate and settle the affair. And you lords here should come down from your haughtiness, which you will, at any rate, be constrained at last to do, whether you will or not. You should *abate your tyranny and oppression*, that the common people also may have air and space to breathe." See Meurer's Life of Luther, p. 311.

But that he urged the suppression of the revolt by the most prompt and severe measures, no one, who has any knowledge of human nature or any regard for civil government and the rights of property, can for a moment doubt. Promptness and severity were the only remedies that could be applied, and were, in the end, true mercy. The ferocious passions of the people had broken loose. Anarchy was about to upheave society from its foundations and sweep away all the institutions of society. A sanguinary mob was taking upon itself all the functions of legislator, judge, and executioner. How were these disorders to be checked? how was the march of this army to be arrested? All experience shows that there is no remedy at once so efficacious, and in the end so merciful, as that of Napoleon, when he closed the bloody drama of the first French revolution, by stationing his battalions at the head of every street, and sweeping them not merely with powder, but with ball, until the spirit of anarchy was quelled.

The peasants and Anabaptists, it is well known, anticipated in 1525, the bloody deeds of the French revolution of 1790, and the wild dreams of the Socialists and Communists of our own day. Besides this, led on by Münzer and Storch, and encouraged by Carlstadt, they claimed a divine right, scriptural authority, and direct inspiration and revelation from heaven, in favor of all their disgusting practices and horrid atrocities. Carlstadt became their convert, and even Melancthon was in doubt whether these deluded dreamers, fanatics and impostors might not be sent from God and illuminated by his Spirit! It was necessary, therefore, not only firmly to fortify men against these errors, but to encourage them boldly to resist the impious plans of those who pretended to act in the name of God. Hence it was, that Luther now so strongly asserted the divine origin of civil government, the duty of citizens to obey magistrates or civil rulers, and the right and duty of the government to enforce obedience, especially for the suppression of mobs and anarchy.

As to his inculcating "the doctrine of passive obedience," it would be very difficult to show, how his teachings differ from those of Christ and his Apostles. "Christians," says he, "do not fight for themselves with the sword, nor with guns, but with the cross and with suffering; just as their leader Christ does not wield the sword, but hangs upon the cross. Therefore their victory does not consist in having power, or superiority, or in ruling, but in inferiority and weakness, as St. Paul says in 2 Cor. 10: "*The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God.*" Christ has said, "*He that taketh the sword shall perish by the sword,*" and Paul, "*Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. The powers that be, are ordained by God. Whosoever resisteth the power (government), resisteth the ordinance of God.*" Rom. 13: 1-7. Five years after, his views were thus embodied in the Augsburg Confession, Art. XVI., than which it would be difficult to find any expression of sentiment upon this subject either more judicious or more scriptural: "Concerning *civil affairs* they teach, that . . . christians ought to obey their magistrates and laws, except when they command that which is sinful, for then they should obey God rather than men. Acts 5: 29."

It must also be borne in mind that Münzer and the peasants proposed to promote the Gospel and establish the Reformation by the sword, and it is against this idea mainly that Luther directs his argument. Their other grievances, he expressly says, he leaves to civilians and men versed in worldly affairs. But such a mode of propagating the Gospel we would not tolerate either in peasant or in noble. And who can doubt that in this he was right, and that this is not only the scriptural doctrine, but the only one in accordance with which the rights of conscience can be secured? If one party may use force, so may another. But the religion of Christ is not one of force, but of reason; not of hatred, but of love; not of injury, but of good works. It cannot, therefore, be promoted by the sword, which its great Author expressly disclaimed and rejected. And in this Luther imitated him. When, therefore, the peasants professed to be carrying out Luther's views, it was not only natural but proper, that he should utter his disclaimer, and protest in the most energetic and decided manner possible. But to return to Dr. Sears' book:

Whilst we take these exceptions to it, we still, as we have already said, find much in it to admire, and could therefore wish that the "*Committee of Publication*" for the American Sunday School Union had more carefully exercised its revisory

power in striking out these and various other objectionable and unjustifiable statements. Were it not for these, we should most cheerfully and gladly recommend the work to our readers, not only as a lively narrative, but as altogether the best presentation, in the English language, of the earlier life of Luther, and, on that account, particularly worthy of being put into the hands of children in our Sunday Schools. But as it is, we should be very sorry to have our young people form their estimate of many of Luther's doctrines, and of various important passages in his life from the book before us. We must also add that even if these errors were corrected, Dr. Sears' work is rather one for the scholar and man of critical research than for the general reader, much less for children. A good life of Luther for the young still remains a desideratum in the English language.

W. M. R.

ARTICLE XI.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

The recent progress of Astronomy ; especially in the United States.
By Elias Loomis, Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy in the University of the City of New York, and author of a course of Mathematics. New York, Harper & Brothers ; 1850.

WE have read a considerable part of this book with much interest and pleasure. The author says of it in his preface : " This little volume is designed to exhibit in a popular form the most important astronomical discoveries of the past ten years." It begins with a full account of the discovery of the planet Neptune, and of all the points of interest connected with this newly detected inmate of our section of the universe—this our long concealed fellow traveller through the realms of space. This portion, and that which treats of the comets, are all that we have actually read ; and taking these as fair specimens of the book, we cannot doubt that it will be welcome to all, who, without being astronomers, take an interest in these studies and their important results. To all such we most cordially commend the volume, as one most agreeable and useful, discussing with great clearness and ability a great variety of subjects embraced by the science of astronomy,

English Grammar.—The English language in its elements and forms, with a history of its origin and development. Designed for use in Colleges and Schools. By William C. Fowler, late Professor of Rhetoric in Amherst College. New York, Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St., 1850.

THIS is a stout 8vo volume, of nearly 700 pp., a most formidable affair for an English Grammar. But Prof. Fowler has here measurably done for the

English language, what Grimm, Schmitthenner, and others have long since amply done for the German: he has supplied what, among teachers and students, has long been a deeply felt desideratum; and we, for one, should not object to a much larger book. But even the one before us can be used in schools only in judicious selections, to be made by the instructor. Every page of the work affords evidence of the author's rich scholarship—of extensive research, profound study, and careful thought. It is divided into eight parts, as follows:—Part I. The origin and history of the English language: II. The Phonology of the English language: III. Orthographical forms in the English language: IV. Etymological forms in the English language: V. Logical forms: VI. Syntactical forms in the English language: VII. Rhetorical forms in the English language: VIII. Poetical forms: These parts are divided and subdivided into a great number of chapters and sections, and the whole concludes with a treatise on punctuation. The work contains a large amount of most important and interesting historical matter; its definitions are clear, accurate and comprehensive, free from those queer absurdities which have so long disfigured English grammars: its discussions and deductions are logical, sound, and most satisfactory: its illustrations are copious, apposite, and in themselves interesting: its multiplied details are rich in linguistic facts, principles, and relations, and the arrangement and connection of all the parts in the production of one great systematic whole, are admirable. The book has already been introduced in a number of colleges: it ought to be carefully and thoroughly studied in all the colleges and higher schools of our country. We have often observed with profound amazement, the ignorance exhibited by college graduates of the origin, the forms and principles of their own language. The publication of Prof. Fowler's work will hereafter deprive such ignorance of all excuse. We hope it will be speedily introduced in all the higher seminaries of learning, as the only truly complete and philosophical grammar of the English language extant.

Elementary Sketches of Moral Philosophy, delivered at the Royal Institution, in the years 1804, 1805, and 1806. By the late Rev. Sydney Smith, M. A. New York, Harper & Brothers. 1850.

THOSE of our readers who have any acquaintance with the writings of the late Rev. Sydney Smith, will readily conceive that the present volume partakes largely of that peculiar tone of thought and criticism for which he was so greatly distinguished. Many of the subjects discussed in these lectures have not, abstractly considered, any very direct or obvious connexion with moral philosophy, however important and influential their relations to man's moral nature and culture unquestionably are. Our author treats them with his accustomed power and sound sense; develops and exhibits facts with great clearness and precision; unfolds and illustrates principles, and sets forth their various relations, with striking sagacity and great acuteness of speculation; chastises the follies of the skeptics and other perverse theorists with all his caustic wit, and wonted severity of sarcasm; treats the absurdities, errors and vagaries of mankind, either with good humored banter, or with stern rigor; and altogether presents to us a work full of sober and sound reflection, calculated both to entertain, and to instruct and profit. The work

is introduced by a highly commendatory letter, written by the celebrated Lord Jeffrey, a few days before his death, and is every way worthy the careful attention of all sober-minded and thoughtful men.

Life and letters of Thomas Campbell. Edited by William Beattie, M. D., one of his executors. In two volumes. New York, Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1850.

It is now six years since the mortal remains of the illustrious poet whose name is written above, were deposited in their last resting place in Westminster Abbey. Many years before his death he obtained from his most intimate friend, Dr. Beattie, a conditional promise, that he would be his biographer. Of this compact his friend was gently reminded by the poet when on his death bed; and in order to enable him to perform, in a fitting manner, the duty thus imposed upon him, every document necessary for that portion of his history which belongs to the public, was placed in the worthy Doctor's hands. The result is the two beautiful volumes which now lie before us. As regards the manner in which the biographer has discharged the kind office which he consented to assume, there can, we think, be but one opinion. Admitting, even, that there is here and there a little more diffuseness than is necessary, we have found no details in the book, however minute, that we should wish to see omitted; and of the editor's faithful industry and good taste in the use of his copious materials, there cannot be the slightest question. To him the preparation of this work was truly a labor of love, the result of which must be highly satisfactory to all the admirers of the author of "The Pleasures of Hope," of "Gertrude of Wyoming," &c. &c. It will undoubtedly prove an unperishing urn on that "monumentum aere perennius," which the poet has himself erected in his immortal works. It consists, indeed, in a great measure, of Campbell's own correspondence, not only presenting the most beautiful specimens of epistolary writing, but opening for us a window to look deep into his generous spirit, into his noble and loving heart. Whether we consider it as a tribute to his genius, or as a portraiture of his character, public and private, social and domestic, moral and religious, the work is one of intense and fascinating interest. The American edition opens with a letter to the publishers from Washington Irving, in which our distinguished and amiable countryman presents some pleasant personal reminiscences of Campbell, which, however brief, give an additional charm to this very delightful book. Let those who wish duly to appreciate, and to see ample justice done to an illustrious poet, much misunderstood and often misrepresented, procure Dr. Beattie's elegant volumes.

The Shoulder-knot; or sketches of the threefold life of man. A story of the seventeenth century. By B. F. Tefft. New York, Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1850.

THIS work is the production of a distinguished clergyman of Cincinnati. The story, although there is a strong infusion of fiction, is authentic, being founded on certain well-known events connected with the reign of Louis VIII, and the personal history of his queen, Anne of Austria. The story is told, in general, with great clearness, elegance and power, although not free

from defects as regards the connexion of events, the unity and continuity of the plot. But, whatever may be the merits of the narrative itself, the author desires it to be regarded as of altogether subordinate moment. It has served him solely as the medium for the conveyance to the public of certain opinions—of serious thoughts—of carefully elaborated views, respecting man's threefold life—the physical, the intellectual and the spiritual—both in his present state of probation, and in the world to come. For the utterance of these opinions the person selected is the great Lord Bacon, and he is here made to discourse words of deep wisdom and of solemn meaning to man in his relations to God and eternity. This more important portion of the work is written with great power, with strong feeling, and not unfrequently with deep pathos and stirring eloquence. The earnest spirit and the pious fervor which pervade these parts of the book, strongly commend it to the attention of thinking and serious readers.

Dr. Johnson: His religious life and his death. New York, Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1850.

THERE is in every man a large share, greater or less, according to his own character, of what Carlyle calls "Hero worship:" we would rather designate it as a feeling of intense admiration, and of profound reverence for men whom we esteem great and good. There have been on the stage of human life, a good many men, towards whom we acknowledge that we cherish this feeling, deep, fervent, and lasting, in our inmost soul. And there are not many in respect of whom it is stronger and warmer, than the great and illustrious subject of the memoir named above. We have not had time to read through the work before us: we have glanced through it, and read sundry parts with care and attention, and we gratefully receive it as another tribute to the genuine greatness, the sterling worth, and exalted excellence of Johnson's character. We needed not this testimony to raise our estimate of one, whose vast influence in literature and in society was exerted only for good, but we are thankful for whatever serves to confirm and establish our exalted opinion of his true greatness, and his eminent goodness, and to invite the admiring attention of men to an example like his; and of such evidence we have a full and generous exhibition in the present work, which is more particularly designed to portray his moral and religious character. It is well known that Johnson had some strong prejudices; but we see in the volume before us, that in their active manifestation they were controlled by a liberal and humane spirit, and tempered by an unaffected benevolence, and a comprehensive charity, whilst for all hollowness, meanness, unbelief and wickedness he had nothing but unsparing severity. Aside of the principal subject, the work presents a great number of interesting anecdotes, and a large amount of attractive and valuable information. To all admirers of Samuel Johnson, to all who delight to contemplate eminent illustrations of the power of truth over the heart and life of man—of distinguished examples of sincere piety, of consistent virtue and unfeigned benevolence, and of a devout regard to the will of God, in life and in death, we cordially commend this interesting and instructive volume.

The history of Darius the Great, by Jacob Abbott; with engravings. New York, Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St.

HERE is another volume of Abbott's Historical Series. The only serious fault we have to find with these volumes, so attractive and instructive to the young, so interesting to all lovers of history, is, that the style is not only frequently inelegant, but sometimes even positively ungrammatical. With so skilful a writer as Mr. Abbott, such blemishes can arise only from inattention; and although of no vital importance, they ought to be studiously avoided by one who can write so well. The present volume exhibits, in an eminent degree, the pleasing and substantial characteristics of its predecessors. The style is, in general, easy and appropriate, the narrative flowing, abounding in striking incidents, and instructive details, and interspersed with apt observations and profitable reflections. These beautiful and exceedingly interesting volumes cannot fail to delight and benefit both young and old.

The Autobiography of Leigh Hunt, with Reminiscences of Friends and Contemporaries; in two volumes. New York, Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1850.

LEIGH HUNT's name has long been familiar to every man of letters. He is now an old man, and his long career as a votary of literature, but especially his intimate relations, during many years, to a goodly number of the most distinguished literary men of his day, render him not only an object of interest, but a depository of many choice recollections, so that his autobiography written in his easy and sprightly style, with much frankness and a great deal of quiet humor, cannot be other than deeply interesting and attractive.—Throwing aside his wonted self-complacency, and the absurd oddities which he has so often paraded before men's eyes, he has here produced a work which will doubtless be read with extreme delight by all who have any familiarity with the literary developments and characters of the last fifty years.

And we are only sorry that we are obliged to burden our praise of this production with some weighty qualifications. The serious reader will expect in vain to find in it those sober views of life which the Scriptures inculcate. It is brimfull of exceedingly interesting and delightful reminiscences, personal, political and literary; of sparkling conversation, of scintillating wit, and of piquant anecdote; but of its philosophy of life, cheerful indeed, but purely Horatian, and of the glimpses which it affords of the author's tone of thought and principle—of his own innermost life—we have not received the most favorable impression. Treating, as it does, of almost every variety of subjects, even theology comes in for its share of discussion; and here we have been simply disgusted. In religion, Hunt seems to belong to the school of Godwin: he is a Unitarian, and worse than this, a strenuous Universalist. He writes well on other subjects of general interest—on subjects which he understands: but on this great theological subject he is superlatively ignorant; and the flippancy with which he, again and again, utters trite commonplaces on universal salvation as the necessary effect of God's infinite love, and the dogmatical impertinence with which he declares that every church which desires to continue in existence, will have to renounce the doctrine of eternal punish-

ments, and adopt what he terms "cheerful views in religion," are purely silly, ridiculous and nauseous. But we think our readers need not fear that the work will do aught to commend these opinions to others: as already intimated, it contains nothing on the subject but the most trite and shallow commonplaces, long familiar to every American man, woman and child, that reads religious and other newspapers. Bating these drawbacks, we readily concede, that this is a most charming work. Leigh Hunt's character and position, personal and literary, may be justly described as many sided; and his pleasant gossip about himself and many illustrious contemporaries; the easy grace with which he performs the duty of cicerone among circles and scenes not open to the million, his bonhomie, his quaint but genial humor, his kindly and generous spirit, and, as before said, his ample store of delectable reminiscences, and of rare and pleasant anecdotes, render this autobiography one of the most agreeable books that we have seen for a long time.

A Second Book in Greek; containing Syntax, with reading lessons in prose; prosody and the dialects, with reading lessons in verse, forming a sufficient Greek Reader, with a Vocabulary. By John McClintock, D. D., late Professor of ancient languages in Dickinson College. New York, Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1850.

MOST important and valuable aids for the acquisition of the ancient languages have been, of late years, furnished by American scholars. Among these Dr. McClintock holds a distinguished rank. In the present work he has supplied an appropriate sequel to his "First book in Greek," which has had a most favorable reception. There is nothing novel in the method of teaching Greek here adopted, for in all its essential features, it has long been most successfully pursued by other classical scholars. We consider the superiority of this method to the drudgery to which, in our young days, we were subjected, as fully established; and Dr. McClintock's books are certainly to be ranked among the best in that class of improved school-books, which display as much as any thing else, the progress of the age. We commend these books to the careful and candid consideration of instructors, persuaded that they cannot fail to win the approbation of all competent judges.

NUMBERS 4 and 5 of Southey's life and correspondence have been received. They are rich in biographical narrative, and in a great measure filled, like the preceding numbers, with the poet's own charming letters to his friends and family. Those written during his visit to Holland are peculiarly interesting. The more we read of this life of Southey, the more do we respect his character, and revere his memory. He was not only great and distinguished in various walks of literature: he was a generous, noblehearted man, possessed of a most delicate sense of honor, and full of genuine, active and self-denying benevolence; and more, he was a truly good man, a serious and devout christian, living ever with the solemnities of death and eternity in view, and maintaining a deep and fruitful sense of his duty and accountability to the Judge of all the earth. While we cannot sympathize with his high-toned church principles, we discover even here a just liberality, and that charity which does not behave itself unseemly, which thinketh no evil, and

hopeth all things. His profound respect for religion, and his steadfast and consistent piety, eminently and honorably distinguish him among men of letters; and we rejoice to observe, that similar examples are, of late, becoming more frequent in the literary world.

A Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament. By Edward Robinson, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Biblical Literature in the Union Theological Seminary, New York; Author of "*Biblical Researches in Palestine*," &c. *A new Edition, revised, and in great part re-written.* New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1850.

As respects this work, it seems scarcely necessary to do more than inform the theological world, that the author has himself prepared "a new edition, revised, and in a great part re-written." Dr. Robinson is so well known as a Biblical scholar, and a profound critical philologist, that his name on the title page, is alone the most satisfactory recommendation that any work in sacred literature can have. The present new edition of his excellent lexicon has been handsomely got up by the enterprising publishers, and to be sought needs only to be known. The learned author has bestowed years of research and assiduous labor upon its improvement: it would be impossible to prepare a Greek and English lexicon of the New Testament on a more thorough-going and comprehensive plan than his, without overburdening it with superfluous matter, and rendering it needlessly expensive. After exhibiting in the preface, the plan of the work, he says: "to the execution of which (the plan) the author has unweariedly and repeatedly devoted the best powers of many of the best years of his life; with what success, the theological public must judge. We are quite prepared to bear witness to the complete success with which the plan has been executed: we know of no similar work in the English language, that could bear a comparison with the one here offered to the American theological public.

The Country Year-Book; or, The Field, the Forest, and the Fire-side. By William Howitt, Author of "*The Book of the Seasons*," "*Rural Life in England*," &c. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1850.

THE author of this work says, in his modest preface: "The following work is the result of many years' delightful enjoyment of the country, and observation of life and scenery," . . . "in this volume is comprised an abundance of matter illustrative of the pleasures and pursuits of human life in the country—in the field, the forest, and by the fire-side." The author's observations on those suggested by, and adapted to, the different months of the year, so that we have them arranged in twelve sections. Howitt is well known as one of the most amiable and agreeable writers in our language; his writings betray a genuine love, and an intense enjoyment of nature; and the genial and devout spirit which has characterized former productions of his pen, and invested them with a peculiar charm, is equally conspicuous in the present volume. His rambles through the country are not confined to England, but carry us over a considerable portion of Germany; the reflections suggested to his mind by the several months are characteristic of a true

and religious poet; he introduces us to a variety of interesting characters—the old and the young squire; the village school-master; the English farmer and his household: the gamekeeper and his satellites; the local sects (Mucklockites, Bryonites, Thornites, Roeites, &c.) of England, and their preachers; with many other pleasing portraiture. The book is full of entertaining incident, of amusing anecdote, and of interesting illustrations of national character, manners and customs. We took up the volume in order to examine it sufficiently to enable us to write a suitable notice of it, but we found its attractions so great that we could not lay it aside, until we had read, in detached portions, the greater part of it; and we assure our readers that they will find it one of the pleasantest volumes ever penned by William Howitt; and those who are acquainted with his writings will admit that this is no small praise.

Health, Disease, and Remedy, familiarly and practically considered, in a few of their Relations to the Blood. By George Moore, M. D., Member of the Royal College of Physicians, &c. &c. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St., 1850.

WE think that, in general, little or no good comes of families having and reading books on disease and its treatment: it usually sets the imagination to work, and leads to mischievous experimenting with medicines. But, while we think that medical books ought ordinarily to be banished from the family circle and the fire-side, we would except from the proscription, the work before us: it is written with so much prudence, judgment, good sense and wisdom, that it cannot possibly do any harm; and it communicates a great deal of interesting and valuable information, just calculated to excite salutary thoughtfulness, and proper caution and care, without alarm or needless anxiety; and to induce regular and wholesome habits, without awakening that timid concern about one's diet, and other matters connected with health, which often opens the door for the introduction of the very evils that we wish to avoid. The author is as much distinguished for common sense as for professional learning, and his book will be a valuable acquisition to individuals and families.

Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Thomas Chalmers, D. D., L.L. D. By his Son-in-Law, the Rev. William Hanna, L.L. D. In three Volumes. Vol. II. New York, Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St., 1850.

THE second volume of the life of Dr. Chalmers is before us. It contains the narrative of his settlement and career of labor in Glasgow, probably the most laborious and extensively useful, and most brilliant portion of his life, so steadily and faithfully devoted to the service of the Great Master. To clergymen, therefore, and to mature minds generally, this volume will doubtless, be more interesting than the first: to sober christian readers it cannot but possess a deep and absorbing interest. We are eagerly expectant of the concluding volume, in which we are to follow that great master-spirit to the close of his toils and endurances on earth.

George Castriot, surnamed Scanderbeg, King of Albania. By Clement C. Moore, L. L. D. New York: D. Appleton & Company, 200 Broadway. Philadelphia: Geo. S. Appleton, 164 Chestnut St. 1850.

WE are glad to see that our esteemed friend, Dr. Moore, has once again, in his green old age, resumed his pen, to narrate to us the stirring life and the splendid achievements of the renowned Scanderbeg: the work could not have fallen into better hands than those of so ripe and accomplished a scholar as the author. Castriot was a most remarkable man; and, notwithstanding the skeptical neglect and disrespect of the disingenuous Gibbon, his illustrious name and deeds will ever be recorded with admiration on the page of the impartial historian. Our author's materials have been chiefly derived from Lavardin's Translation of the great work by Marinus Barletius, in thirteen books, "*De Vita et Gestis Scanderbegi*," written betwixt 1450 and 1467. The life is written *con amore*, and exceedingly well narrated: and to those who delight in reading of stirring incidents, daring enterprises, and brilliant achievements,—in this instance those of a christian prince combating for his paternal crown and the liberties of his country, against the treacherous Sultan Amurath and his immense armies—the volume will afford, not only most luscious entertainment, but also valuable information.

A Pronouncing German Reader, to which is added: Method of Learning to read and understand the German Language, with or without a Teacher. By James C. Oehlschläger, Professor of Modern Languages in Philadelphia, and Author of a Pronouncing Dictionary of the English and German Languages. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 200 Broadway. Philadelphia: Geo. S. Appleton, 164 Chestnut St. 1850.

IN this volume Professor Oehlschläger renews the oft-repeated attempt to enable students to acquire a correct pronunciation of the German language without the aid of a teacher. We doubt whether the experiment can ever lead to very satisfactory results. We must, however, do the Professor the justice to say, that his method exhibits more judgment and skill than any other that has come under our observation. The pronunciation, however, takes up only 42 pp. of the volume, which numbers 254 pp., and which, as a reader for students, is truly admirable: the selections are exceedingly appropriate and delightful: the vocabulary, at the end, is just the thing for those who, in studying a language, treasure up in the memory every word as it occurs. The book cannot fail to be acceptable and useful.

Select Orations of M. Tullius Cicero: with Notes, for the use of Schools and Colleges. By E. A. Johnson, Professor of Latin in the University of the City of New York. New York: D. Appleton & Company, 200 Broadway. Philadelphia: Geo. S. Appleton, 164 Chestnut St. 1850.

THIS edition of *Select Orations of Cicero* claims, as its chief merit, to present a new and improved text, for which purpose the editor has availed himself of

the results attained through the labors of Orelli, Madvig, Klotz and others.—He gives us, accordingly, “the text of Orelli, as revised by him subsequently to his edition of the entire works of Cicero,” except in the orations “for Marcellus and for Milo, which are not found in Orelli’s edition. The text of the Milo is a reprint of that of Madvig; and that of the Marcellus, of that of Klotz.” To the admiring reader of Cicero, any real improvements in the text, resulting from the searching investigations of German classical scholars, must be highly welcome. The notes are exceedingly ample, and are almost exclusively drawn from the productions of German scholarship, those given in Arnold’s edition being retained in full. The editor has spared no pains in the performance of the duty which, at the request of the publishers, he had assumed: and we do not doubt, that both instructors and students will find this volume a most effectual aid to the attainment of “true and accurate scholarship.”

First Greek Book; on the Plan of the First Latin Book. By Thomas Kerchever Arnold, M. A., Rector of Lyndon, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Carefully revised and improved by Rev. J. A. Spencer, M. A., Professor of Latin and Oriental Languages in Burlington College, N. J. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 200 Broadway. Philadelphia: Geo. S. Appleton, 164 Chesnut St., 1850.

ARNOLD’S Books for instruction in the Latin and Greek languages are already so well known, and so highly appreciated, that they can scarcely require any additional commendation: we certainly know of none that are better. Professor Spencer has introduced, in the present edition, sundry valuable additions and important improvements: “he has amplified the earlier Lessons and Exercises; added simple and clear explanations where they seemed to be needed; inserted ‘Questions,’ rather as suggestive of what may be, than as expressive of all that should be asked; has referred frequently to Kühner’s valuable Grammar for fuller elucidation of difficulties or peculiarities &c.”—The whole plan of the work, and its execution, are equally excellent, and we almost envy the young of the present day their school-books, so far superior to those which introduced our budding intellect to the treasures of classic lore.

ERRATA, IN THE JULY NUMBER, VOL. II.

- Page 2d, 18th line from above, insert *Maryland*.
 “ 5th, 8th line from below for straightest read *straitest*.
 “ 22d, 6th line from top, for Maunday read *Maundy*.
 “ 182d, 2d line from top, read *nonfundamental*.

OCTOBER NUMBER.

- Page 242, 1st line top, for the read *like*.
 “ 250, 11th line from below, after staring insert *crowds*.
 “ 262, 8th line from below, for in read *on*.

JANUARY NUMBER.

In the article on Norwegian Church for *Hange* read *Hauge*.
 Other errors can be corrected by the intelligent reader.